

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXIV.

BALTIMORE, JANUARY, 1909.

No. 1.

KING LEAR IN CELTIC TRADITION.

In an Ossianic ballad called *Dan Liuir*, printed by J. F. Campbell in his *Leabhar na Feinne*¹ (1872) from a collection made by Duncan Kennedy in 1774, tradition represents Ossian as relating to St. Patrick an interesting episode in the careers of King Lear and Finn MacCumhail. The vicissitudes of the ever-rankling quarrel between Finn and Goll, chief of Clan Morna, a rival band of Fianna, compelled Finn to betake himself to the court of Lear, where he was entertained with bountiful cheer, bardic songs, and the music of harps. The feast was interrupted by the approach of Goll with a powerful fleet. Whereupon the obliging and amicable Lear ventured forth with only three attendants to meet Goll, whom he succeeded in reconciling to Finn.

Finn found opportunity for requiting the hospitality of Lear, when one day he descried the latter, "a poor, infirm, weak, and despised old man," a veritable "Lear's shadow," wandering about unattended by even a poor fool, bereft of his kingdom, and reduced to beggary. What strange mutations had brought him to this low estate, whether blood had proved unkind, or machinations of foes too successful, the ballad fails to record, being more taken up with the generosity of Finn in returning favor for favor.

The above ballad has been reprinted along with the music, which is of a character peculiar to Fingalian songs, by Mr. Malcolm MacFarlane in *Guth na Bliadhna* (Aberdeen, Aug., 1907). In the following translation of this version, the present writer is indebted to Mr. MacFarlane for the explanation of a number of obscure passages:

Finn journeyed one day to the house of Liur
In company with thirty-one men;
The man of least account among us
Was chief of an army of three nines.

¹ A collection of Scotch Gaelic traditional ballads relating chiefly to the Ossianic cycle; see pp. 125 ff.

The wife of Liur sat at the shoulder of Finn,
Finn sat at the side of Liur;
King Art sat at the side of Aodh,
By the side of Aodh of mirthful mien.

Conachar and Cormac sat together
By the side of Aodh of the beautiful skin,
And so on forth:
Every one that was there sat down to meat.

Through the hall was wafted the music of harps
And bardic songs chanted melodiously;
The humped bow on every instrument
Was making mirth and music.

Thus we whiled away the time,
And pleasant indeed was our state;
Wanting neither honey nor wine,
Nor melody and the music of fiddles.

In such wise were we till the day of the meeting,
Merry, joyous, and with sorrow banished;
Until there broke upon our view
The host of Goll drawing near on the wave.

Then it was that Finn spoke out:
"I see a sight that is unpleasant to me:
Yonder I see the fleet of Goll
Sailing toward us to Driom-feann.

"And banners I see floating high
On the pointed masts over Driom-bhagh;
In that conflict of banners above our heads
We have no part nor our host of spears."

Cormac of victories advised us then;
Gave us advice that was truly hard:
"Though wise in experience are you all,
You three shall protect us from that man."

Then it was that Liur spoke out:
"Goll is under obligation to me;
And if the man remembers it,
He would account me well deserving of good-will."

Liur sallied out then to meet Goll,
Accompanied by three others on horse-back;
And pleasantly he saluted him,—
Great to-night is the glory of my tale.

"May fortune prosper you, O Goll,
The best of men under the sun;
The best are you for favor and honesty,
Better far are you than me.

"Do you remember the day of the speckled horse,
On Fraochan above Tom-cliar?
When I gave to you the gray horse
Would bear you speedily over the mountain?"

"Since you have done thus to me, O Liur,
Most hospitable of men under the sun,
If you have a request to prefer,
Rise, and you will get it readily."

"There was a guest in my house last night,
Fionn MacCumhail, strong as the crust of the earth,
(obscure)
Allow him to depart safely over the mountain,
Since he has eaten at my board."

"Return whence ye came,
O brave host from Innis-freoin;
And by the soul that lives in my body,
The word of my mouth will not be broken."

We all proceeded to the house of Liur,
And found therein both honey and wine;
Though to-day it is cold and desolate,
It was once an abode of kings.

I myself saw the house of Liur
And plentiful within was honey and wine;
And I myself saw afterwards
Liur and his hospitable wife in want.

And I myself saw afterwards
Wanting food both man and wife,
Making their way from house to house
Seeking what house would provide them meat.

One day while Fionn was hunting
With his Fianna brave on Ben Luir,
Whom did he see afar off
But the high king named Liur.

At once he sped to meet him,
For the affection and love he bore him;
He permitted no one else to accompany him
That Liur might be spared all shame.

"Long life to you, O Liur,
Bestower of favors, obliging and kind;
Many gifts have you made to me,
Asking nothing in return.

"You gave to me while you sat at the wine
Thirty-one cows with their calves;
A young fool calf following each cow,
On the heather above Driom-caol.

"You gave to me one hundred and eighty horses
To bear me safely away from danger;
And thirty-one ships for my equipment,
To carry me home over the sea.

"Freely you bestowed those things on me,
Without refusal, without stint;
Nor did you bespeak a price
For land and visit, speech and praise."

"I am indeed no longer Liur,"
Said the man renowned for clemency;
"Preferable far to me is death
Than to be found in his likeness."

"Truly you are no other than Liur,"
Replied the man of the beautiful skin;
"Accordingly you will receive
Repayment in full, gift for gift.

"I'll give to you cow for cow,
I'll give to you horse for horse,
I'll give to you ship for ship,
To bear you safely o'er the waves.

"Every chief on the face of the earth
I'll force to restore your land to you;
I'll make you full wealthy again,
And send you safely to your house."

My king fulfilled everything he promised.
Six days they spent then in sports together;
In fair garments he clothed them both,
The wife and hero of greatest fame.

A hundred horses were sent to defend him
And to guide him to his land;
Pleasant and mirthful was the time
The Fians spent in company with the hero.

These were the exchanges the two kings made,
Thus they repaid their obligations to each other;
Lovely were they, amiable and generous,
Full of mercy and courtesy.

A thousand blessings to you every season,
O Oisín, hospitable and sweet of voice;
For the tales so pleasant
You have related to me during my life.

The normal disregard of popular tradition for congruity has here operated to reduce to a petty kinklet a sea-god whose origin and nature are enveloped in an obscurity as baffling as a druidic mist. From the failure of the few meagre references to him in Irish literature to body him forth with well-defined features, we know little of him beyond that his name means the sea (*Lir* nom., *Lir* gen.), and that he belongs to the *Tuatha de Danann*, or folk of the goddess *Danu*. How far he justifies the title of the Irish *Poseidon*, sometimes conferred on him by modern writers, is beyond conjecture, for Irish legend early stripped him of all association with the sea, bestowing on his son *Manannan mac Lir* the attributes of a sea divinity. In Irish poetry, however, is preserved the memory of his connection with a watery realm. Such a reference is to be found in the *Song of the*

Sea, for the Sea-Kings of Dublin by Rumann, the "Irish Virgil" ²:

"Storm is on the plain of Lir (*i. e.*, the sea)
Bursting o'er its borders here," etc.

"The ploughing of Lir's vast plain
Brings to brave hosts pride and pain," etc.

The vast period of time over which his existence stretches, together with the fact that most of the tales which give him anything more than a local habitation and a name, viz., the Ossianic, are comparatively late, may account for the minifying of his powers and his possible confusion with other Lirs.

No one, to my knowledge, has approached the subject of Lir from the Irish side except O'Curry, whose article, however, is well-nigh inaccessible, being locked up, as it were, in the exceedingly scarce volumes of the *Atlantis Papers*.³ Hence reproducing in part the argument of this valuable contribution to the subject will be nearly equivalent to offering new material. And since it is impossible to consider Lir genealogically apart from his son Manannan mac Lir, to whose name and fame he chiefly owes his perpetuation, the nature and rôle of the latter must be involved in the discussion.

It is chiefly in connection with the mysterious race of the Tuatha de Danann that he is most frequently met with. This race, in the mythological period of Irish history, overran Ireland as the second great migration. According to pagan Irish belief, they descended upon the country from Heaven; later Christian coloring made them appear as having dwelt formerly in some northern land, where they had learned druidery, *i. e.*, magic, which they employed to obscure the sun for three days after their arrival. At any rate, all accounts invest them with supernatural powers. They in turn had to yield to the third and last body of migrators, the Milesians, from whom are descended the chief Gaelic families. After their disastrous defeats by the latter at Taillten (Teltown) and Druim Lighen (Drumleene), they

dispersed over the country, quartering themselves in sid-brughs (fairy mansions) among the hills and mountains, whence, still endowed with the attributes of gods, they issued forth, invisible to mortals, to work good or evil. The evolution of popular belief has reduced them to the fabled life of the "good people" of Irish fairy lore. They are represented in Ossianic legends as sometimes warring against Finn and the Fianna, and as sometimes coming to their aid; *e. g.*, in the Battle of Ventry, whither they resorted in response to Finn's appeal for help against the invading forces of the King of the World. "Are those yonder the Fianns of Erin," asks the latter. "No," was the answer, "another lot of the men of Erin that dare not be on the surface of the earth, but live in sid-brughs under the ground, called Tuatha de Danann."⁴ As appears from this battle, although of divine origin, they are not exempt from being put to hard straits, nor even, as we learn elsewhere, from violent death.

The tale naturally laid under requisition first for material, because of its suggestive title and its currency, is that of the *The Fate of the Children of Lir*,⁵ belonging in manuscript to the seventeenth century. This modernised story offers little to link him with the character we know through Geoffrey of Monmouth, unless it be the element of tragic suffering that attends his footsteps. In this tale the suffering is brought about, not through filial ingratitude, but through treachery dealt out by the step-mother on the children. The version of this tale extant in the *Book of Fermoy* is significant in that it represents Manannan mac Lir as presiding over the assembly of the Tuatha de Danann chiefs and apportioning out the land. Among these chiefs is Lir, to whom is assigned for a dwelling-place Sid Finnachaid, *i. e.*, the hill of the White Field, on the top of the Few mountains in County Armagh. Apparently the Lir of the famous "Children" is not he who is father to Manannan.

In the Ossianic tales also he comes to light only as a chief of the Tuatha de Danann race. That

² *Bards of the Gael and the Gull*, Dr. George Sigerson, 2nd edit., 1907. (The Rumann belongs probably to the eighth century.)

³ *Note on Manannan mac Lir in Atlantis Papers*, vol. iv, pp. 226 ff.; O'Curry, 1863.

⁴ *Cath. Finntraga*, edit. with translation by Kuno Meyer, 1885.

⁵ Edit. with translation by O'Curry in *Atlantis Papers*, vol. iv, 1863. Also translated in Joyce's *Old Celtic Romances*, 2nd edition, 1894.

he is identical with the Lir of the preceding tale is inferable from the name of his residence, Sid Finnachaid, from his rank, and from the qualities attributed to him. The few additional features yielded up by these tales are as follows. He is numbered among the Tuatha de Dananns who hasten to the relief of Finn at the Battle of Ventry, where, however, he more than meets his match in his mortal adversary. The *Colloquy of the Ancients*⁶ relates that, at a council held by the Tuatha de Danann chiefs, one of them is made to say, "Let Lir of Sid Finnachaid advise us since he is the oldest of the Tuatha de Danann." In another place mention is made of Lir as engaged in feuds with some of his brother chiefs, in one instance marching to the assault accompanied by his twenty-seven sons and their sons. In one of these engagements, while seeking to avenge the slaughter of his "baleful bird" on Cailte, one of the Fianna, who was enjoying the hospitality of Ilbreac mac Manannan of Easa Ruaid (Assaroe), another of the Tuatha de Danann, Lir lost his life. Cailte, seeing the host approach, asked, "What seems to you the most dangerous conflict?" "The man of greatest valor among the Tuatha de Danann," said they, "that is, Lir of Sid Finnachaid." Cailte, true to his custom of choosing the most perilous combat, sought out Lir, and after a furious battle came off victor, leaving Lir dead on the field.

Before we attempt to straighten out his genealogy, it will be well to dispose of two isolated references to Lir. In the Bodleian *Dinnsencas of Sinann*⁷ occur lines which remember his divine origin: "Sinend, daughter of Lodan Luchar, son of Lir, out of the Land of Promise," etc. O'Curry mentions in his list of heroic tales named in the *Book of Leinster* (twelfth century) the *Three Circuits of the House of Lir*.⁸ But this tale of the attack on Lir's house has not been preserved.

⁶ *Acallamh na Senorach*, Irische Texte, vierte serie, 1 heft; edited by W. Stokes from the *Book of Lismore* (fifteenth century). The *Colloquy* is a series of dialogues between Cailte, one of the last of the Fianna, and St. Patrick.

⁷ See *Manners and Customs of the Ancient Irish*, O'Curry, vol. II, Lecture vii, 1873.

⁸ *Lectures on Manuscript Materials*, App. p. 584, O'Curry, 1873.

According to O'Curry,⁹ the only Lir mentioned in the genealogical tract on the Tuatha de Danann in the *Book of Lecan* (fourteenth-fifteenth centuries) is he who was father to Manannan, and this only in one stanza of an ancient fragmentary poem quoted in this tract:

Manannan, son of Lir, from the Lake,
sought many battles;
Oirbsen was his name; after hundreds
of victories, of death he died.

Now, in a poem written by Flann of Monasterboice (ob. 1056) on the manner of death of the Tuatha de Danann chiefs, we find another name given to the father of Manannan:¹⁰

Elloit the renowned fell,—
The great fierce father of Manannan,—
And Donann, the perfect, comely,
By De-Domnann of the Formorians.
The son of Alloid the renowned fell,
The illustrious, wealthy Manannan,
In the battle in hard Cuillinn,
By the hand of Uillenn of the red weapons.

The parentage and locale of Manannan are further illuminated by the following passage from the *Yellow Book of Lecan* (fourteenth century)¹¹:

Manannan, the son of Alloit, a druid of the Tuatha de Danann; and it was in the time of the Tuatha de Danann he flourished. Oirbsen, indeed, was his true name. It was this Manannan that resided in Arann (in the Firth of Clyde) and this is the place which is called Emhain Abhlach (Emain of the Apple-trees); and it was he that was killed in the battle of Cuillinn, by Uillenn, son of Catir, son of Nuada of the Silver Hand, in contention for the sovereignty of Connacht; and when his grave was dug, it was then Loch Oirbsen burst over the land (out of the grave) so that it was from him that Loch Oirbsen (now Loch Corrib) is named; he was the first Manannan.

This was certainly the Manannan who distributed the Tuatha de Danann chiefs to their hill residences; still he is not called the son of Lir, though the first stanza quoted above, where he is called Manannan, the son of Lir "from the Lake," seems to identify him with Oirbsen, who

⁹ Note on Manannan mac Lir in *Atlantis Papers*.

¹⁰ *Book of Leinster*, fol. 6a; the stanzas quoted are the 4th and the 29th.

¹¹ The Ms. H. 2, 16, T. C. D., col. 881.

gave his name to Loch Oirbsen. This Oirbsen, or Manannan, the son of Alloit, is again set down as the son of Lir in an anonymous poem written for Ragnall Arannach (Randal of the Arann Island), a Dublin Dane of the eleventh century. In praise of Arann runs one stanza so :

If the hosts of the men of the lands were yours,
From the Boyne till you touched the Tiber,
More important to you for honey and mead-joy
Emhain (i. e., Arann) of the Son of Lir, son of Migher.

There can be no doubt that the "Son of Lir" spoken of here was the great Manannan of Emhain of the Apple-trees. It would seem then that tradition and scribal carelessness have confused the two Manannans, attributing the acts, gifts, and residence of the Son of Lir to the Son of Alloit. That this confusion is of ancient standing may be seen from the following item taken from the genealogical tract in the *Book of Lecan* :

These are the three sons of Alloit, son of Eladan (son of Delbaeth, son of Neit), namely : Manannan the merchant, who traded between Erin and Albain ; and it was he that used to know the coming of the foul or the fair weather in the sky ; and Bron, the son of Alloit, . . . and Ceiti, the son of Alloit.

Again in Cormac's *Glossary*—written about 890—occurs another description of Manannan :

Manannan, son of Lir : that is, a famous merchant who resided in Inis Manann (the Isle of Man) ; he was the best mariner that was in Western Europe. . . . Inde Scoti Britones eum deum vocaverunt maris ; ejus inde filium esse dixerunt (i. e., Mac Lir, son of the sea) ; et de nomine Manannan, Inis Manannan dicta est nomen, et de nomine Manann Insola Manann dicta est.

We may then identify Manannan mac Lir, of the Isle of Man, and of Emhain Abhlach, with Manannan mac Alloit, of Loch Oirbsen, in Connacht. He must not, however, be confounded with the Manannan, son of Athgnai, who protected Naisi and Deirdre in their exile and who nursed and reinstated their son after their death.¹² That the Lir slain by Cailte is not the Alloit, son of Eladan, is clear enough, for the latter, he it remembered, met his death at the hands of De-

domnann, a Fomorian. We must look to the poem on Randal Arannach for the true parentage of Lir, the father of Manannan, for the Lir of the Ossianic tales is spoken of as the son of Lughaidh. So concludes O'Curry's argument.

That Manannan is a god, restless and fickle, as fond of shifting his shape as his abode, is seldom lost sight of in Irish romance. His mysterious palace lies somewhere in an isle of the sea, inaccessible to the average navigator, where he holds sway as Lord of the Land of Promise, of the Happy Other-world, the Honey-plain, around whose borders

"Summer sea-steeds leapt and ran
Far as reach the eyes of Bran.
Rivers run with honey clear
In the fair land of Mac Lir."

He possessed many famous weapons, some which never failed to slay.¹³ Two of these, the "Great Fury" and the "Little Fury," he loaned to Diarmait in his flight with Grainne from the vengeance of Finn. His horse, called "Splendid Mane," which was fleetier than the wind and was equally at home on water as on land, together with his impenetrable armor, formed the equipment of Lugh, when the latter, in his capacity of ambassador, cast the Fomorian camp into wondering inquietude. His boat, named the "Wave-sweeper," renowned for propelling and guiding itself at the wish of its occupants, bore the ill-fated Children of Tuirenn in their quest for the treasures of the East. And his shield, which was fashioned from the Ancient Dripping Hazel, the withered tree on which was fixed the head of Balor of the Evil Eye, after Lugh had cut it off at the Battle of Moytura, later became the shield of Finn.

Manannan mac Lir is an important figure in the epic cycle of the Cuchullinn tales, which have been approximated to the time of Christ, and also plays a considerable part in the Ossianic cycle. In the person of his own son Mongan, of the sixth century, he brings about a re-birth of Finn, of the third century.

Welsh legends present scarcely less hazy outlines of Lir. Here, too, divested of all remem-

¹² *The Fate of the Children of Uisnech* ; see *Atlantis Papers*, p. 416, O'Curry. This Manannan is called the "fourth Manannan."

¹³ See *The Mythology of the British Isles*, p. 60, Charles Squire, 1905.

brance of his connection with the ocean, he is well-nigh submerged in the fame of his son Manawyddan mac Llyr. Nor does the latter figure entirely in the rôle of an ocean deity, but appears also as a shoemaker and a tiller of the soil, having been deposed from his throne by an intruder.¹⁴ Some reminiscences of his associations with the Land of Promise, however, are evident in the state of peace and plenty in which he and his companions dwell so long as they carry about with them the head of his brother Bran. That he was a master of magic could be attested by no less a personage than Arthur, who was at one time a captive in the prison which Manawyddan constructed of human bones for the confinement of those who trespassed in his Underworld.

It has been suggested that the name Llyr Lleidiath (Llyr of the Foreign Dialect) applied to him in Welsh literature, and the name Iweridd (Ireland), given to one of his wives, render probable the supposition that he may have been borrowed by the Britons from the Gaels subsequent to a common Celtic mythology.¹⁵ The name Llyr itself is a source of confusion. The Welsh translated the Latin Leir of Geoffrey of Monmouth into Llyr.¹⁶ The form Leir looks to be derived from *legr-* of *Legraceaster*, now *Leicester*. The river *Legra*, from which the city took its name, has been regarded as the old name of the *Soar*, and as extant in that of the village *Leire*, spelled *Legre* in the *Doomsday Book*. It probably points back to a *Legere* or *Ligere*, which recalls *Liger*, 'the *Loire*.'

He who would attempt to unravel the snarl in which the stories of *King Lear* and his three daughters have become involved in Welsh and English tradition should consult *The Story of King Lear*, wherein are discussed very thoroughly the stories, their probable origin and relation, and their fortune, until once for all time fixed by Shakespeare.¹⁷

EDWARD GODFREY COX.

Cornell University.

¹⁴See "Manawyddan, the Son of Llyr," the *Mabinogion*, translated by Lady Guest, 1877.

¹⁵*Arthurian Legends*, p. 130, J. Rhys, 1891.

¹⁶*Celtic Folklore*, vol. II, p. 547, J. Rhys, 1901.

¹⁷Published in *Palæstra*, No. xxxv, Wm. Perrett, Berlin, 1904.

THÜMMEL'S REISE AND LAURENCE STERNE.

Moritz August von Thümmel's *Reise in die mittäglichen Provinzen von Frankreich im Jahre 1785 bis 1786*¹ has been mentioned in a general way as one of the most important German imitations of Laurence Sterne. The following is an attempt to show briefly the extent and nature of Thümmel's relationship to the English master and to note some striking differences.

Thümmel, like Sterne, starts out in pursuit of health, but apart from this initial motive both travellers are chiefly interested in the opportunities to observe the workings of the human heart. They revel in sentimental situations and seek first in every place stimulation of the sympathetic emotions. Such expressions as "Das menschliche Herz," "Das Spiel des menschlichen Herzens," "Kenntnisse des menschlichen Herzens" are of constant occurrence in Thümmel's account of his adventures. Both travellers ignore completely the ordinary objects of the sightseer's interest. The passage in which Thümmel expresses his attitude of indifference with reference to the sights of Paris seems hardly more than an elaborated paraphrase of Yorick's well-known statement. He testifies formally at the frontier on his return that the purpose of his journey has been the search for health and "die Verbesserung meines Verstandes und Herzens."

In motive and incident there are frequent suggestions of Sterne. The traveller is asked to take a lady into his carriage. He twice encounters maimed veterans who are reminiscent of Sterne's old soldiers. There is a sentimental visit to a tomb like Sterne's pilgrimage to that of Amandus and Amanda. The beautiful woman crazed through love and grief is a direct imitation of Maria of Moulines. One notes further the peasants' dance, Yorick-like praise of the patient ass, a devotion to sentimental mementoes, ruthless interruptions of sentimental situations by inter-

¹In ten parts, Leipzig, 1791-1805. In two contemporary reviews Thümmel's name is connected with that of Sterne (*Allg. dt. Bibliothek*, Vol. 108, pp. 343-349, and *Gothaische gelehrte Zeitungen*, 1791, II, pp. 305-7). For other reviews and contemporary opinions, see the article on Thümmel in Jördens.

position of the commonplace, tacit acknowledgment of Yorick's division of travellers into categories, constant examination of motives for actions and discussions of the moral aspect of conduct. As in "Shandy" discussions of curious topics are found, and use is made of odd old books, casuists, theologians and scientists. There are frequent appeals to the reader to skip a passage, to help the author, for instance, in describing the beauty of a woman, or to justify a course of action. A genuinely Sterne's idea is the oft-mentioned collection of window-panes on which autographs or sentiments have been written.

The relation between Thümmel and his servants is also reminiscent of Sterne; for instance, he takes one of them into the carriage with him, as Sterne did, and lets another sit down at the table with him. Thümmel brings into his narrative also certain objects which through Sterne had gained a sentimental currency, like the horn snuff-box, or nettles growing on a grave. But Thümmel has adopted Sterne's manner most completely and most frequently in the scenes which border on impropriety. He copies very successfully Sterne's method in the clever insinuation of indelicacies. The constant assertion of innocence in compromising situations, the perilous proximity of sleeping arrangements, accidental bodily contact and nudity are part and parcel of Thümmel's machinery.

Several scenes of Thümmel's journey could hardly have been written had not Sterne's Pater Lorenzo sentimentalized the monk. The most striking of these scenes is the visit to the galley where the capuchin labors in the midst of inconceivable misery. As a narrator of sentimental scenes Thümmel, like Sterne, beholds in priest and monk representatives of unselfish devotion and human kindness, but his general attitude toward the Roman Church differentiates itself widely from that of Sterne. His contempt for certain phases of church life is openly and vigorously expressed, and far beyond a flippant ridicule of belief in saints and the efficacy of relics one finds genuine opposition to the Catholic clergy and formal attack upon the whole church system. This antagonism is an unmistakable animus pervading much of the book. In his capacity of a thoughtful observer of existing conditions Thüm-

mel treats the church with hostility and scorn, as a sentimentalist, he celebrates the devotion and humanity which he witnesses in some of her servants. In Sterne's work scenes and events are described only in the medium of his sentiments and emotions; in this consists the exquisite simplicity of the *Sentimental Journey*. In Thümmel's record we have not only his emotions coloring his interpretations of foreign life, but we find also at considerable length the convictions and conclusions of an observing and analytic mind.

Thümmel's outspoken German patriotism contrasts strikingly with Sterne's indifference. The German seeks opportunity to hear his mother-tongue, and to meet with his fellow-countrymen. Sterne avoids his compatriots. Descriptions of external nature, so conspicuously absent in Sterne, are extensive and appreciative in Thümmel's *Reise*. The trend of German thought and feeling in the intervening decades made this inevitable, and, similarly, the idealization of rural simplicity and the sentimental acceptance of democratic ideas are more pronounced than in Sterne's day. Rousseau's influence in these matters is marked. He is mentioned many times in the book, and a bust of him is frequently referred to as a mute critic of the author's conduct. The idea of the return to nature is repeatedly and definitely expressed.

In eccentricity of external form Thümmel never suggests Sterne. The narrative is like a succession of little stories bound together by the thread of a traveller's experience. It would be possible to take out of the book a number of separate stories, well-rounded complete "Novellen." The frequent use of verse is a noteworthy difference in external form from Sterne's two narratives. In this respect we are reminded of Chapelle, who is indeed mentioned once in the text.

In spite of dissimilarities Thümmel's *Reise* must be classed as a "Sentimental Journey"; its spirit is in the main unquestionably derived from Sterne; the literary genre has been determined by the English master. In many cases the influence of Sterne is also observed in the details of the narrative and the style of the narration. Yet it is not a mere imitation. To Sterne's sentimentalism have been added powers of sound observation and reflection. It is a later

"Sentimental Journey," modified by decades of more substantial democratic thought and social theorizing, infused with a new devotion to the beauties of nature, less humorous and essentially German.

HARVEY W. THAYER.

Princeton University.

NOTES ON THE EGLOGES OF ALEXANDER BARCLAY.

It is well known that Alexander Barclay's fourth Eclogue is a paraphrase of Mantuan's fifth, also, that his fifth Eclogue is a paraphrase of Mantuan's sixth, with the insertion of a long passage taken from Mantuan's seventh.¹ But this is not all that he borrowed from his chief model in pastoral verse,² from the poet whom he extols even above Theocritus and Virgil—

As the moste famous Baptist Mantuan
The best of that sort since Poetes first began.

Even in his other Eclogues a part of the pastoral setting is taken from Mantuan.

The beginning of the first—with its mention of the great storm which has damaged the crops, its rebellious complaint that evil falls upon the just as well as upon the unjust, and its attempt to justify the ways of God to men—is all due to the beginning of Mantuan's third. Compare, for example, the passage,

A thousande illes of daunger and sicknesse,
With diuers sores our beastes doth oppresse :
A thousande perils and mo if they were tolde
Dayly and nightly inuadeth our poore folde.

¹ For details, see O. Reissert, *Neuphilologische Beiträge*, Hannover, 1886, pp. 14–31. One item which is taken bodily from Mantuan (VII, 42–54) is a "detailed notice of a mural painting in Ely Cathedral, which has long since disappeared"—a painting which struck one of Barclay's editors as "very curious," *Publications of the Percy Society*, vol. xxii, p. 43. It is cited also in the *Dictionary of National Biography* (s. v. Alexander Barclay) as a proof that Barclay's Eclogues were written at Ely.

² Not that he translated "six of Mantuan's Eclogues," as Professor C. H. Herford says in his edition of *The Shepherds' Calendar*. The 'Prologue' carefully states that "foue Egloges this whole treatise doth holde."

Sometime the wolfe our beastes doth deuour,
And sometime the thefe awayteth for his hour :
Or els the souldiour much worse then wolfe or thefe
Agaynst all our flocke inrageth with mischeffe,

with Mantuan, III, 22–24 :

Mille premunt morbi pecudes, discrimina mille
Sollicitant, latro insidias intentat ouili,
Atque lupus, milesque lupo furacior omni ;

and the lines,

This is the rewarde, the dede and worke diuine,
Unto whose aulters poore shepherdes incline :
To offer tapers and candles we are fayne,
And for our offering, lo, this we haue agayne,

with Mantuan, III, 28–29 :

Hoc superi faciunt, quibus inclinamur ad aras,
Et quibus offerimus faculas et cerea uota.

Nor can the two speakers begin their paraphrase of the *Miseriae Curialium* of Æneas Sylvius without being reminded of Mantuan's ninth Eclogue, *De Moribus Curiae Romanae*. Hence the punning allusion to one "worthy courtier," Bishop Alcock,

He all was a cocke, he wakened us from slepe,
And while we slumbred he did our foldes kepe, etc.,

which is adapted from the complimentary allusion to Falco Sinibaldus, "ouium custos ipso uigilantior Argo"—

Pastor adest, quadam ducens ex alite nomen, etc.

The beginning of the second Eclogue—where Cornix has been detained by an overflow of the river, and by the labor of "strengthening our bankes, and heyghting them agayne"—is borrowed from the beginning of Mantuan's second. Compare Coridon's comment on the situation,

The earth in this poynt is like maners of men,
From hye groundes water descendeth to the fen.
The hye mountaynes of water them discharge,
And lade the riuers with floudes great and large.
Agayne the riuers dischargeth them likewise,
And chargeth the Sea : so mens common gise
Is alway to lay the burthen or the sacke
(Which them sore griueth) upon some other backe,

with the comment of Fortunatus, Mantuan, II, 12–16,

nam liquitur altis
Nix hyberna iugis, implent caua flumina montes :
Se exonerant fluuiosque onerant : sic flumina rursum

Se exonerant, pelagusque onerant. hominum quoque mos est,
Quæ nos cunque premunt, alieno imponere tergo.

In the fifth Eclogue, in addition to all that is taken from Mantuan's sixth and seventh, there is a passage which comes from Mantuan's second. Compare the words of Amintas, toward the close of the poem,

What man is faultlesse, remember the village,
How men uplondish on holy dayes rage.
Nought can them tame, they be a beastly sort,
In sweate and labour hauing moste chiefe comfort.
On the holy day assoone as morne is past,
When all men resteth while all the day doth last,
They drinke, they banket, they reuell and they iest,
They leape, they daunce, despising ease and rest.
If they once heare a bagpipe or a drone,
Anone to the elme or Oke they be gone.
There use they to daunce, to gambolde and to rage,
Such is the custome and use of the village.
When the ground resteth from rake, plough and wheles
Then moste they it trouble with burthen of their heles.
To Bacchus they banket, no feast is festiuall,
They chide and they chat, they vary and they brall,
They rayle and they route, they reuell and they crye,
Laughing and leaping, and making cuppes drye,

with Mantuan, II, 66-75,

Rustica gens, nulla genus arte domabile, semper
Irrequietum animal gaudet sudore, peracto
Mane sacro, festa (quando omnibus otia) luce,
Ipsa oti ac famis impatiens epulatur, et implet
Ingluuiem, audito properat tibiae ad ulmum,
Hic furit, hic saltu fertur bouis instar ad auras.
Quam rastris uersare nefas et uomere, terram
Calcibus obduris et inerti mole fatigat,
Ac ferit, et tota Baccho facit orgia luce,
Vociferans, ridens, saliens, et pocula siccans.

In Barclay's 'Prologe,' too, there is an interesting parallel to a passage in Mantuan's dedicatory epistle. This epistle, dated 1498,³ begins with a playful riddle :

Audi, o Pari, ænigma perplexum, quod Œdipodes ipse
non solueret. Ego quinquagenarius et iam canescens,
adolescens meum reperi, et habeo adolescentiam simul
et senectam.

The explanation is, that in the previous year he had found a certain youthful composition of his own, consisting of eight Eclogues and, "ab illa

³ The *Dictionary of National Biography* (s. v. Alexander Barclay) says that Mantuan's Eclogues "appeared about 1400."

ætate," entitled *Adolescentia*. And now he sends it forth again, in revised and augmented form. But history repeats itself, and it was not long before Barclay could report a similar experience :

But here a wonder, I fortie yere saue twayne
Proceeded in age, founde my first youth agayne.
To finde youth in age is a probleme diffuse,
But nowe heare the truth, and then no longer cause.
As I late turned olde bookes to and fro,
One little treatise I founde among the mo :
Because that in youth I did compile the same,
Egloges of youth I did call it by name.

And now he too has "made the same perfite"—

Adding and bating where I perceyued neede.⁴

In Barclay's fourth Eclogue there is inserted a stanzaic poem entitled, 'The description of the Towre of vertue and honour, into the which the noble Hawarde contended to enter by worthy actes of chivalry.' This is a "wofull elegy" upon the "laste departing of the noble lorde Hawarde," the English admiral who died in 1513. As its title might suggest, it seems to owe something to *Le Temple d'honneur et de vertus* (c. 1503), written by Jean Lemaire de Belges, "à l'honneur de feu Monseigneur de Bourbon." Thus, Barclay's "castell or toure" is set

High on a mountayne of highnes maruelous,

just as Lemaire's is seen "sur une montaigne haulte et spectable dont le sommet surpassoit de beaucoup les nues errans en region aerine."⁵ It is a "building olde"

Joyned and graued, surmounting mans brayne,
And all the walles within of fynest golde,

just as Lemaire's is "ung edifice sumptueux a merveilles a maniere dung temple antieque en ouvrage, mais riche outre mesure en sa façon." And men attain unto it by "holy liuing," by

⁴ It is interesting to notice that Professor ten Brink found in these lines the explanation of a peculiar quality of Barclay's Eclogues, namely, their combination of the freshness of youth with the maturity of manhood: "So erklärt es sich, wenn diese Dichtungen in höherem Grade als andere Werke Barclay's jugendliche Frische mit männlicher Reife in sich vereinigen" (*Geschichte der Englischen Litteratur*, vol. II, p. 455).

⁵ *Œuvres de Jean Lemaire de Belges*, publ. by J. Stecher, Louvain, 1891, vol. IV, p. 216.

"wisdom," by "Justice and equitie," etc.—a list of virtues which roughly corresponds to the six images set at the portal of Lemaire's temple: Religion, Prudence, Justice, Equité, Espérance and Raison.

In E. K.'s famous epistle to Gabriel Harvey he suggests that Spenser wrote in pastoral form, "mynding to furnish our tongue with this kinde, wherein it faulteth." Just how he could ignore Barclay's five Eclogues, is not very clear. They must have been fairly well known at that day, even if they were not very highly valued. Indeed, it is possible that he had Barclay's 'Prologue' definitely in mind when he wrote this particular passage. The "example of the best and most auncient Poetes, which devised this kind of wryting, being both so base for the matter, and homely for the manner, at the first to trye their habilitie," had already been cited by Barclay:

Therefore wise Poetes to sharpe and proue their wit,
In homely iestes wrote many a mery fit,
Before they durst be of audacitie
Tauntere thinges of weyght and grauitie.

The simile, "as young birdes, that be newly crept out of the nest, by little first to prove theyr tender wyngs, before they make a greater flyght," may be set beside another passage in the 'Prologue,'

The birde unused first flying from her nest
Dare not aduenture, and is not bolde nor prest
With winges abroad to flye as doth the olde, etc.

And it is surely significant that the first five pastoral poets in E. K.'s list—Theocritus, Virgile, Mantuane, Petrarque and Boccace—are the five poets mentioned by Barclay, in the same unusual order. For the obscure lines,

What shall I speake of the father auncient,
Which in briebe language both playne and eloquent,
Betwene Alatheia, Sewstis stoute and bolde
Hath made rehearsall of all thy storyes olde,
By true historyes us teaching to obiect
Against vayne fables of olde Gentiles sect,

must allude to Boccaccio. They suggest, to be sure, the title and the professed purpose of his *Genealogia Deorum Gentilium*, rather than his sixteen Latin Eclogues.

WILFRED P. MUSTARD.

Johns Hopkins University.

STYLE AND HABIT: A NOTE.

A systematic and exhaustive study of literary style from the psychological point of view yet remains to be undertaken. Hitherto the studies put forward in English from this point of view have been inadequate, and, with the exception of Spencer's erroneous essay, distressingly vague and general. DeQuincey's essay was seminal, but only seminal. His Organology and Mechanology, and his passage on Publication, are too brief and general to be called developed theses: DeQuincey would not descend to Spencer's minuteness. On the other hand, Lewes, though always promising something detailed and definite, never really settles down from his inspiring platitudes. Renton, to mention but one more, has preferred the logical point of view, and in his plethora of metaphysics upon sensibility has parted company with the strictly individual character of style. The French attempts are almost equally disappointing. When engaged in a search for those peculiarities and nuances of mental make-up which distinguish the infinite varieties of individuals, one from the other, it is neither sufficient to divide mankind in general, as De Gourmont does, into two great classes *les visuels et les émotifs*, nor satisfying to account for any one individual, as Hennequin would, by predicating him with an over-development of the third frontal convolution. Such observations are undoubtedly valuable, but they are woefully fragmentary when put side by side with the mental complexity which is present in any great writer and which, by its multiple variations of tendency and emphasis, constitutes the unique thing called his individual character. To conduct a thorough-going, psychological inquiry into literary style is a task whose general magnitude is equalled only by the minuteness of its particular details. Not one or two principles of a general nature, not one or two categories for the distribution of mankind from China to Peru, but rather the application of well-nigh all the observations of an entire two-volumed psychology to each author contemplated, and the careful notation of varying values and tendencies in each case, is what is needed and what has never been undertaken.

In essaying such a task the old confusion of four points of view, which has been the cause and

bane of all the loose discussion of the subject at the hands of those mysteriously blest with a "literary sense," would easily be avoided. These views, the descriptive, æsthetic, pedagogical, and genetic points of view, have seldom been rigorously segregated or even properly distinguished in prose-style theory from Aristotle to Spencer. The adoption of the genetic or psychological view, including as it does the conception of style as a normal aspect of ordinary psychic functioning in words, and therefore a common aspect of all writing, good or bad, but varying in its details of tendency and emphasis from individual to individual, excludes alike the æsthetic conception of style as "good-style," the descriptive definition based upon the reader's general and vague "sense" of an author's style, and the pedagogical precept that style is a detachable ornament or a mere thing of verbal and syntactical mechanism which may be learned by clever address to the rules of rhetoric. The genetic view recognizes with primary emphasis that thought and feeling processes, and verbal expression, and the psychological inter-relations of these, furnish the materials for definite categorical investigation. Æsthetic appreciation and pedagogical fervor must not interfere in a purely genetic inquiry.

The two primary facts mentioned above, that style is an aspect of all writing, except strict compilation, and that it is something that varies as we pass from individual to individual, suggest the method to be adopted in a psychological inquiry into the nature of literary style. The first fact embraces the material of the inquiry (mind expressed in written words). And of this material three aspects must be considered: the nature and kinds of thought (including emotions and feelings), the relations of thought to words, and, finally, the relations of words to each other, grammatically and syntactically considered. The field indicated is of course the whole field of general psychology *plus* the special fields of the psychology of written expression and the science of grammar and syntax. But the work in these fields has, fortunately, been already done, for the most part by specialists within each territory. Of their rich results the methodical student of style may now avail himself. The least developed field is that

of the psychology of the written word as distinguished from the spoken word. Of course the old and much debated question of thought with words and thought without words will necessarily pop up and prove something of a bogey; but now-a-days there is much new light upon this matter; and, besides, for the actual production of written words, which involves a concurrent stream of thought and words, the question is hardly of deterrent importance. On the other hand, far more attention than ever before must be paid to the influence of the so-called sub-conscious factors which play a prime part in the production of what is termed "inspired writing." Here, too, much material and observation have been collected, especially of late, by trained specialists.

The second primary fact (style is a variant which varies with the individual) suggests the next step in method. It is obvious that in psychology, as in any organic science, the character of individuality is distinguished by the variations of the particular subject within a common generic type. Now the multiplicity of such variations in the psychologic individual is as highly as it is intangibly increased over the variations in the anatomical individual; and if these variations of mental and emotional economy always occurred in an unique and sporadic fashion, their very multiplicity and ephemeral nature would produce a confusion of successive, aberrant individualities instead of that fairly stable thing which we call the character of the individual. In a word, variation alone will produce individuality within a species, but variation alone will not produce what in the human species we call individuality of character. The definiteness of this latter appearance demands a corresponding definiteness or regularity in individual variations. Instead of sporadic cases, the variations must assume a repetitive tendency. A tendency to act consistently and repeatedly in certain ways, which are at more or less variance with the ways of other people, is what constitutes individuality of character.

It is necessary, therefore, when once the description of thought relations and thought-word relations in general is as far as possible complete, to observe what funding and coördination of particular variations any particular author's case presents,—what variations by their repetition

evinced stable tendencies. In the case of Shelley's prose, for instance, the lyrical progression of his thought by imaginative rather than ratiocinative association of ideas and images is a trick so often repeated that it becomes at once a peculiarity and a stable peculiarity, *i. e.*, a stable variation. Thus that variation of individuality of character to which common experience gives an aphoristic recognition, but which is rather recognized than definitely conceived, may be somewhat exactly analyzed and accounted for. To be sure, the analysis will involve a statement of variation in degree and emphasis from common kinds of mental action even more often than a statement of variation in quality, but the very difficulty of such statements goes a long way to explain rationally the prevailing vagueness of appreciations of literary characters. Moreover, it may be noted in passing, that perhaps written speech alone offers that quality of permanency which is necessary to the object of a minute psychological analysis into character; and, as Renton well observes, a psychological inquiry into style may throw much new light upon psychology itself. That the writing of an author shows him only in certain moods and delineates his character at its best rather than in its entirety, is a contingency which, while it rather fortunately eliminates for us comparatively unessential traits, may yet be minimized, if that is thought desirable, in cases where the more pretentious literary remains of an author are supplemented by his familiar, undress expression in diaries or letters.

To such regular variations of thought-feeling and thought-word relations, which in their synthetic complexity present the author's character through the somewhat deflecting media of words, may be applied the term style. Variations which are not coördinated by repetition cannot be said to constitute a style. In this sense, and in this sense only, a writer may be said to have no style; but that is practically equivalent to saying that all writing has style, since ignorance most of all has its regularity of stupidity. Occasionally the sporadic variation is so exaggerated as to obtrude itself strongly upon the attention,—as in the case of a single poetic figure in a text-book in mathematics. But that sporadic variation is to be noted as such: it would not justify one in speaking of

the poetic style of the book. Where the variation is sufficient in degree or kind to be termed pathological, style becomes striking in its bizarre and extravagant effects—those effects which, usually apprehended most easily, are most definitely described. But for those other, usual, and more subtle traits of individual style which, though perceiving, we despair of describing save in the vaguest of figures, the regular variations within the limits of the normal may be taken as the cause.

But these regular variations of thought and thought-word relations, these more or less stable tendencies coördinated by repetition, present to the psychologist a law of functioning which has already been deeply studied in other than literary phenomena; and the present literary problem should be studied in the light of what has already been determined from the study of the same character of functioning in other and similar contents. This law of function is called Habit. Literary style therefore should be investigated as a problem in the psychology of habit, and upon it should be brought to bear all those discovered data and principles which are now included by psychologists under the category of habit. The observations of James, Tarde, Baldwin, and Jastrow would yield rich results if properly applied. The circular-reaction theory and the laws of imitation and invention, for instance, would go a long way to supply the discipline of style and rhetoric with that philosophical basis which the methodical mind of Spencer desired. The formation of individual habits by direct and original adaptation to environment or by indirect and imitative adaptation, by chance variation or enforced instruction; the refractive aspect of imitation; the growth of types of association; the imitative susceptibility and the inventive inclination,—these are only a very few of the principles which would find a rich illustration in the facts and functions of style. The concrete and picturesque elements of style, or its rhythmic effects, whether these belonged to an Isaiah or to a Sir Thomas Browne, to an Inca of Peru or to a Jeremy Taylor; the style of a retired dreamer like Amiel, or of an empire-dreamer like Sir Walter Raleigh; the style of one who talks and writes rather for effect than for matter; the style which is the product of expression concurrent

with thought, as compared with that which belongs to the expression of a thesis already carefully elaborated into logical proportions; the style of the verbalist, or of the abstractionist; or of the emotionalist; of the theologian, or the mystic, or the reformer; of the spectator, or of the participator; the grand style, the *estilo culto*, the metaphysical style, the precious style,—these are only a very few of the aspects of style which would receive their proper explanation and coördination. Moreover, the social aspects of habit, if sought in literary style, would afford to the latter an adequate theory of what is more vaguely designated as the style of a literary period or epoch, or of a race, and would assign to Taine's *milieu* its proper place in the economy of style. The "isms" of style would be explained—Euphuism, Marinism, Gongorism, Asianism, Atticism, Rhetoricism. Individual habit as subjected to the requirements of an external authority, with its temporized acquiescence or flaring revolt—the set of problems so ably discussed by Bagehot and Royce and Tarde—would find its literary homologue in the syntactical and metrical aspects of style and in the impositions of the various literary types. Finally, certain general habits of thinking underlying all these variations would be distinguished as such; and, consequently, instead of speaking of a narrative or expository style, it would be realized that here there is a difference, which must be expressed by speaking of the narrative manner, or expository manner. Style is individual habit within the general manner of a type or kind.

When once it becomes clearly understood that style is a case of habit, the difficulties of the subject begin to clear. Such expressions as "Le style est de l'homme même," or style is the "physiognomy of the mind," take their place as figurative statements of the matter of habit. The chief characteristics of the conception—its vagueness and "indefinableness"—are accounted for by the complexity of subjective habits. The old quarrel as to the propriety of extending the word *style* to all writing or to *belles lettres* alone, is systematically solved. The demand of the literary student for a definite program of work is met so far as the science of mental habit can be brought within observation and definition, and the student understands forthwith in what boundaries his sub-

ject lies, and how far he can treat it methodically—how far science may go, and where appreciation must begin. Nor, to adopt the pedagogical view for a moment, will anyone who has taught literary composition fail to recognize that in the definition of style as habit lies the description, as well as the secret, of his labor with young, untutored minds whose habits have been ignorantly and unconsciously formed.

It would not be venial, even in a mere note such as this, to neglect the warning that must accompany any such minute task as the one here recommended. The task, to be sure, would amount to nothing so much as to restating all our loose criticism of the present on a methodical and as near as might be scientific basis—the basis in psychology long since recommended and prophesied by DeQuincey. The task is not so much revolutionary as supplementary and definitive. But dryly and unimaginatively followed, without the proper generalization, the analysis contemplated would inevitably degenerate into a labor as useless as that of the *Rhetores Græci* themselves; and for the old mechanical discipline, another, quite as defunct, would be substituted. The results of the analyses of style-habits can find their justification only in a wider definition of spiritual meaning and a completer, more authentic conception of the inter-relations of particular characters in the social organism.

BENJAMIN P. KURTZ.

University of California.

THE SINGULAR FATE OF A PASSAGE IN FREYTAG'S *DIE JOURNALISTEN*.

Responding to the editor's request, I submit the following statements as supplementary to my previous article, "A Curious Mistake in Freytag's *Die Journalisten*," published in the *Modern Language Notes*, vol. XXIII, pp. 180-1, June, 1908.

Some half-dozen annotated editions of *Die Journalisten*, as we have seen, give the reading 'Zeitung,' instead of the suggested version 'Zeit,' in the passage previously indicated. In view of the additional evidence now at hand, it seems

more than probable that in each case the form 'Zeitung,' as I already intimated in my former discussion, is indeed directly traceable to some of the older German editions. If this be actually the case, as I hope to show with such new facts as I can produce at this writing, then, I suppose, we shall be justified in saying that the responsibility for this particular reading 'Zeitung,' does *not* rest primarily with our American editors.

Before proceeding to a consideration of the new available data, it will perhaps be interesting to note that, besides the annotated editions with the impugned reading 'Zeitung,' I have also found several others with the version 'Zeit.' There does not, however, seem to be any sufficient reason, at this time, for assuming that this difference is due to an editorial alteration of 'Zeitung' to 'Zeit.' Rather, I should say, is this reading 'Zeit' also to be traced back to German sources. I shall now, with a few words, attempt to reconcile these seemingly contradictory statements.

The Hirzel editions of Freytag's works which were published previous to 1873 have the reading 'Zeit.' Strangely enough, however, the editions which appeared between 1873 and 1889 show the version 'Zeitung' instead of 'Zeit.' The reason for this most singular change does not now appear, and even the author's publisher is at a loss how to account for it. Personally, I cannot conceive Freytag to have been responsible for the change. Indeed, soon after the publication, in 1886, of the first edition of the *Gesammelte Werke*, Freytag seems to have ordered the original version 'Zeit' to be restored. At this same time a sentence which originally stood directly after 'Charakter,' was dropped from the text. For the sake of orientation on this point, I refer the reader to my previous article. The discarded sentence referred to reads as follows: 'Sie sind zwar jetzt ein armer Teufel, aber es wird Ihnen noch besser gehen in der Welt.' As we should expect from what we have noted thus far, we find that the second edition of Freytag's *Gesammelte Werke*, as well as the later editions of his *Dramatische Werke*, and also the two editions of *Die Journalisten* issued since 1890, have, all of them, the version 'Zeit.' The seventh edition of *Die Journalisten*, S. Hirzel, Leipzig, 1882, still shows the reading 'Zeitung.' From these facts it is apparent that the reading

'Zeit'—for which I previously expressed my preference—is the one which will finally have to stand as authoritative. The detailed statements regarding the curious fate of the passage in question are based on information kindly submitted by Freytag's publisher, S. Hirzel, of Leipzig. The facts were communicated to me by Dr. J. Ernst Wülfig, of Bonn (Germany).

As stated in my first article, I am seriously handicapped here as far as the older editions of the play are concerned. Nevertheless, I shall take this opportunity to call attention to still another textual variation in the same passage. From the editions at my disposal, I am able to state that there are at least three distinct versions of the passage as a whole. Besides the points of difference already noted, I find that one of the variant versions has before the negative 'nicht' the intensifying adverb 'gar,' while the other two readings lack this augmentative particle.

Without commenting further upon these interesting variations, I shall now simply enumerate the three versions in full. For the sake of the reader's convenience, it may be advisable to italicize the points of difference. The three complete readings before me are, accordingly, as follows:

- (a) Ihnen kann's in unserer *Zeit* gar nicht fehlen.
- (b) Ihnen kann's in unserer *Zeitung* nicht fehlen.
- (c) Ihnen kann's in unserer *Zeit* nicht fehlen.

As we should, indeed, have expected, the simple, straightforward, and critically suggestive version, 'Ihnen kann's in unserer *Zeit* nicht fehlen,' seems to have received the author's final sanction.

C. H. IBERSHOFF.

Cornell University.

CHAUCER'S ENVOY TO BUKTON.

On the hazard of drawing inferences about Chaucer's married life from so jocose a poem as the address *To Bukton*, we may learn something from Eustache Deschamps. That he satirized

marriage is notorious. We have not only his long *Miroir du Mariage*, but various lyrics of similar tenor. In No. 271 (II, 116), which has a good deal of resemblance to Chaucer's poem, Deschamps praises the freedom of the celibate :—

Les serfs jadis achaterent franchise
Pour estre frans et pour vivre franchis,
Car li homs serfs est en autrui servise
Comme subgiez en servitude chis ;
Mais quant frans est, il est moult enrichis
Et puet partout aler ou il lui plaist,
Mais ce ne puet faire uns homs asservis,
Pour ce est li homs eureus qui frans se paist.

Donc est bien foulz et fole qui est chise
En serf lien d'estre femme et maris, etc.

In No. 340 (III, 54), he calls the man who marries a second time a fool :—

Un chien, un chat, un lievre et un conin,
Un esprevier, un oisel de riviere,
Et les poissons refusent a l'engin ;
Quant prins y sont en aucune maniere,
S'ilz eschapelent, ilz se traient arriere,
D'y rembatre n'ont nulle fois envie ;
Toudis pensent a leur prinse premiere ;
Dont est cilz fous qui deux fois se marie.

Here, too, we may compare the address to Bukton.

No. 823 (IV, 343) is similar :—

Homs hors du senz, plains de forçonnerie,
Tristes, dolens, chetifs et malostrus,
Est li meschans qui deux foiz se marie ;
Puisqu'il s'i est une foiz embatus,
Du premier cop il doit estre tenus
Pour ygnorant, mès qu'il y entre arriere,
Des maleureus doit porter la banniere.

In No. 929 (V, 138) Deschamps dissuades a friend from wedlock. Compare also Nos. 931 (V, 140), 976 (V, 216), 977 (V, 217). In the last-mentioned *balade*, the speaker says that he has been a captive in Syria, and implies that marriage is a worse bondage than slavery among the Saracens :—

J'ay demouré entre les Sarrasins,
Esclave esté en pays de Surie.

Compare *Bukton*, vv. 22-24 :—

Experience shal thee teche, so may happe,
That thee were lever to be take in Fryse
Than eft to falle of wedding in the trappe.

On the usual principles of interpretation—which tend to ignore the obvious probability of convention or of the dramatic touch—such utterances would be enough to show that Deschamps

was unhappy in his married life. Yet in another *balade*—advice of a father to his daughter who has just become a wife—he exhorts the girl to copy the virtues of her dead mother :—

Fille, au depart et a vo bien alée,
Qui par mari estes de moy sevrée,
Vueilliez en bien a vo mere retraire
Tant que de vous, qui bien vous ay amée,
Ne soit nul jour male chançon chantée :
Soiez humble, courtoise et debonnaire.¹

Chaucer's *Envoy to Bukton* may or may not be in good taste, but we are certainly not justified—in view of what we have seen in the case of Deschamps—in allowing it any autobiographical significance. It seems to have been not uncommon to send a jocose message, in dispraise of wedlock, to a friend who had either just married or was on the point of taking such a step. Probably such utterances were no more seriously meant than the jests which are passed upon an intending bridegroom by his intimates at pre-nuptial "stag dinners" now-a-days.² Deschamps was certainly not offended when his friend Simon Ployart favored him with a missive of this kind :—

He ! Eustace, dire pues desormés :
" Adieu bon temps !" car tu l'as tout perdu ;
Soies certain, plus n'en auras jamés,
N'encor ne scez pas qui est advenu ;
Car jusques cy l'en t'a tousjours tenu
Bon compaignon, et tu seras clamez
Chetifs, dolens, es tu bien mariez ?³

Our mediæval ancestors were willing to go rather far for the sake of a joke. Witness the apparent cynicism (peculiarly revolting to us) of one of Deschamps's complaints about the hardship of having to give his daughter a *dot*.⁴ Yet there is every reason to believe that this was the same daughter whom he addresses so tenderly in the *balade* of good advice already referred to.

G. L. KITTREDGE.

Harvard University.

¹No. 1151 (VI, 84). See the sensible remarks of Hoepfner, *Eustache Deschamps, Leben und Werke*, 1904, pp. 53-54.

²Compare the custom of sending satirical or so-called "comic" valentines, which is of considerable standing—so far as age is concerned—though now happily falling into desuetude.

³*Œuvres de Deschamps*, IV, 351. In his reply (No. 830, IV, 352), Deschamps addresses Ployart as "treschier et bon ami."

⁴No. 1150 (VI, 81); cf. No. 1149 (VI, 79).

DARES AND DICTYS.

Dares and Dictys, An Introduction to the Study of Medieval Versions of the Story of Troy. By NATHANIEL EDWARD GRIFFIN. Baltimore: J. H. Furst Company.

Dr. Griffin, in his dissertation on *Dictys and Dares*, has had a wide field of literature to cover, with the mass of erudition that has been expended on the intricate and changing problems of the subject he has chosen. For the history of the medieval Troy legend, the works of Dunger and Joly were not more important than the publications in 1892 of Noack and Patzig who, by a new study of the Troy matter in the Byzantine chroniclers, showed the existence of a longer and more elaborated text of Dictys, than that represented in the Latin *Ephemeris*. They were the starting point for a number of critical studies in the long-neglected field of Byzantine writers, and the results of these studies are for the first time summed up and adjusted in a concise and judicious manner by Dr. Griffin. The general results of all these studies have been fully justified by the publication of the fragments of the Greek Dictys, discovered in the Tebtunis papyrus; but these few fragments show that certain details in the reconstruction of the Greek text, can only be cited as instances of the fallibility of textual critics. Thus the well-warranted conjecture, based upon the date of the papyrus—the early part of the third century—that the Greek Dictys was written at least prior to 200 A. D.,¹ puts out of court at once the assumption (8, n. 3, 110, 119) that the *Prologus*, if written by the author of the Greek Dictys, was indebted to the Life of Apollonius of Tyana of Philostratus, for the fiction of the earthquake in Crete, even if the latter work can be attributed to a date as early as 217.² Further, the detailed description of the death of Achilles, through his love for Polyxena, denoted in the Dictys fragment,³ shows the absurdity of finding the source of the account in the Latin version in the slight

allusions in the *Ἡρωϊκός* of the younger Philostratus, who from the posterior date of his work (213–219)⁴ might well have been the borrower in this as in other episodes.⁵

In the introductory chapter of seventeen pages, Dr. Griffin has summed up the contents of Dictys and Dares, and shown their prevalence and use in medieval literature, and their continued authority as historians and stylists in the learned world down to the eighteenth century. This summary of the whole problem, in which the brief outline of the text is fully substantiated by extensive notes, only calls for a few supplementary remarks, in way of criticism. Collilieux's suggestion (1, n. 3) that the very name of Dictys, and the fiction of the finding of the *Ephemeris* were devices borrowed from Alexander Monachos's account of the discovery of the body of St. Barnabas, could have only been mentioned to state that the stories are so different, that the account of Alexander,⁶ which was written fifty years (525)⁷ after the date of the alleged discovery, of which, naturally, there is no record in contemporary chroniclers,⁸ could

⁴ Münscher, *l. c.*, 498, 508, 557. Griffin, 110, follows Dunger, *Dictys Septimius*, 44–6, in not correctly distinguishing the two writers of the same name.

⁵ Cf. Münscher, *l. c.*, 501, n. 72. The emphasis that Philostratus lays on the campaign in Mysia, and the story of Telephus (Münscher, *l. c.*, 505 ff., 537 ff.), does not make his account as detailed in some particulars as that in the Latin translation. Cf. Dictys (II, 1–7); where (II, 14) the reference to Eurypylos, the son of Telephus, is found in the Greek Dictys (*Tebt. Pap.*, II, 15, ll. 81 ff.). Dunger also thinks that Philostratus is the earliest authority for the murder of Achilles in the temple of Apollo (*l. c.*, 45); with the discovery of the Greek Dictys one can ask whether it is the source of the allusion in the pseudo-Justinian *Apology*, which is dated by Harnack, 180–240, to Achilles who, “τὰ θεόθεν κτα ὄπλα ἀποδυσάμενος, νυμφικὴν στολὴν ἐνδυσάμενος, φίλτρῳ θῦμα ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος νηφ” (Harnack, *Sitzungb. der Berl. Ak.*, 1896, 634, ll. 16–18).

⁶ *Acta Sanctorum*, 3d. ed., Junii II, 444 ff.; cp. Lipsius, *Die apokryphen Apostelges.*, II, 2 (1887), 195, 301.

⁷ Krumbacher, *Ges. d. byz. Lit.*, 2d. ed., 164.

⁸ Malalas, 385; Theophanes, I, 184–5 (which represents the unabridged text of Malalas, cp. Gleye, *Byz. Zeit.*, IV, 157, v, 433; Brooks, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, VII, 292, 299). The mention of the *Inventio* is first found in Theodorus Lector, II, 1 (A. D. 530; Krumbacher, *l. c.*, 291); then in the *Chron.* of Georgios Monachos, ed. de Boor, 618, 21 (842, Krumbacher, 352); and in Kedrenos, I, 618 (1100, Krumbacher, 36).

¹ *Tebtunis Papyri*, ed. Grenfell, Hunt, & Goodspeed, II (1907), 10.

² K. Münscher, *Philologus*, Suppl. x, 489, 557.

³ *Tebt. Pap.*, II, 12–14.

not have even been suggested by the earlier account of Dictys.

As a criterion on the date of both the Greek original and the Latin translation (3, n. 2), no one⁹ has made use of the statements in the *Prologus* telling how Nero "Annales vero nomine Dictys inscriptos in Græcam bibliothecam recepit" and of Malalas' "καὶ ἐν τῇ δημοσίᾳ βιβλιοθήκῃ ἀποτεθῆναι αὐτὰ" (p. 250, 9). The correctness of the phrase "Græcam bibliothecam" is vouched for by the statement of Suetonius¹⁰ that Augustus added in the temple of Apollo "porticus cum bibliotheca Latina Græcaque," and the inscription in regard to an attendant "ab bybliothece Græca."¹¹ This library, divided into two sections, was founded in 28 A. D., escaped the Neronian fire, and was burned to the ground in 363.¹² Does the more general term "Public Library"¹³ of Malalas represent the Greek Dictys, and is the more specific statement due to the translator, who in that case may have lived before the destruction of the library by fire?

The *Historia Daretis Frigii*, interpolated in three manuscripts of the chronicle attributed to Fredegarius, can not be called "two long excerpts from Dares" (5, n. 4), if it is something other than a mere abridgment of the *Historia*.¹⁴ The fashion of contrasting the veracity of Dares and Dictys with the mendacity of Homer was not confined to medieval writers (11, n. 1); the first French translator of the *Iliad*, Jean Sanson (1529-1530), invokes their authority as well as that of Guido delle Colonne, to correct the errors of Homer,¹⁵ after Juan de Mena (1410-1456) had considered it necessary to defend him from the attacks of Guido;¹⁶ and the Marquis de Santillana (1442) pleaded for a Spanish translation of parts of the *Iliad*, even if the works of Dares

and Dictys were available.¹⁷ The sources of the eleventh Oration of Dio Chrysostomos have been examined in more detail than by Chassang (11, n. 2).¹⁸

Rohde¹⁹ and Norden²⁰ have collected many instances of finding manuscripts in the tombs of the writers, which have not been noted by Dr. Griffin and his authority Joly (14, n. 1), and in not a single one is the discovery due to an earthquake, as was the case with the *Ephemeris*, according to the *Prologus*, a notion much more natural in Dr. Griffin's opinion, "than that the tomb of the author merely collapsed through old age" (119).

The fiction of attributing to pretended participants in the Trojan war the authorship of pre-Homeric histories (15, n. 1), finds its counterpart in the favorite autobiographic setting of early Christian apocryphal literature,²¹ and the later literary device of hagiographical writers of speaking in the name of a disciple of a saint in order to give more weight to their accounts.²² The statement that Perizonius's dissertation of 1782 "removed for all time the last vestiges of this peculiar veneration" for the authority of Dictys and Dares (17), shows too optimistic a belief in the kinetic force of truth. Various eighteenth century editions of the two authors attest a lingering popularity and regard, and it must be remembered that Jebb in his study on Bentley pointed out the retarded general acceptance of the results of the destructive criticisms of the *Epistles* of Phalaris, by a scholar incomparably greater than Perizonius.

¹⁷ Morel-Fatio, *l. c.*, 121, 126; Schiff, *La bibliothèque du marquis de Santillane*, 1 ff. Although Santillana writes as if he were acquainted with independent translations of Dares and Dictys, probably he only knew them through the Spanish translation of Guido's work by Lopez de Ayala (cf. Mussafia, *Sitzungsber. der Wiener Akad. Phil. Hist. Klasse*, LXIX, 49 ff.).

¹⁸ W. Montgomery, *Studies in Honor of B. L. Gildersleeve*, 405 ff. ¹⁹ E. Rohde, *Der griechische Roman*, 292-3, n.

²⁰ *Jahrb. f. Philol. Suppl.*, XVIII, 327-8. Birt has noted the custom of poets, on dying, to bring their own works to Persephone ("Persephonæ libellos ferre" Propert., II, 13, 26); and its similarity to the story in Dictys (*Rh. Mus.*, LI, 498; *Die Buchrolle im Kunst*, 83).

²¹ Von Dobschütz, *Deutsche Rundschau*, CXL, 89, 87 ff.

²² Delehaye, *Rev. des questions historiques*, LXXIV. Cf. the practise of the Patristic writers calling early Christian writers, Apostolic, a title to which they had no claim; Harnack, *Gesch. der altchrist. Lit.*, I, xxxvii-viii.

⁹ Cf. Körting, *Dares and Dictys*, 1874, p. 7.

¹⁰ Aug. 29. Cf. M. Ihm, *Centralblatt f. Bibliothekswesen*, x, 516. ¹¹ CIL, vi, 5188. Cf. Ihm, *l. c.*, 525-6, 517.

¹² Ihm, *l. c.*, 519.

¹³ Cf. Ovid's reference to Rome's three public libraries of which that of Apollo was one; esp. vv. 79-80, "interea, quoniam statio mihi publica clausa est, privato liceat delituisse loco," *Trist.* III, 1, 60 ff. Cf. Ihm, *l. c.*, 518; Hirschfeld, *Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der römischen Verwaltungsgesch.*, 187, n. 2, 189, n. 5.

¹⁴ G. Paris, *Romania*, III, 129 ff.

¹⁵ Constans, *Hist. de la langue et de la litt. franç.*, I, i, 217.

¹⁶ Morel-Fatio, *Romania*, xxv, 113.

The second section of the origin of Dictys, occupying more than a hundred pages (17-120), is a clear well-digested analysis of very nearly the complete literature of the subject. Dr. Griffin has established his thesis beyond question, and his work only calls for criticism on a few points. There has been at least one voice of dissent besides that of Greif (23, n.), in the general acceptance of the thesis Dr. Griffin has made his own. Meister in his review of Greif's latest contribution in defense of the original Latin authorship of the *Ephemeris*, accepted Greif's conclusions, and interpreted to their advantage obscure passages in the Latin text, in which his opponents have found confirmatory evidence for their own side of the case.²³ The allusion to Priam's embassy to King David found in one of the fragments of John of Antioch must be due not to the author of the excerpt, as suggested by Dr. Griffin (27, n. 2), but to John himself, from whom Manasses borrowed the episode to pass it on to Hermoniakos;²⁴ and the tradition found a further development in medieval European literature.²⁵

It seems very doubtful whether the sole authority of the eleventh century Arethas, who states that Dictys wrote his work on brazen tablets, "χαλκοῖς πίναξι," is reason enough to reject (32) the repeated statements of the *Ephemeris* that the material used was the product of a linden tree; "libros ex philyra" (1, 10), "in tilias" (2, 8; cf. 11, 18). In all probability the original Greek Dictys did not mention tablets, even if the statement of Arethas is confirmed by Malalas's excerptor, Isaak Porphyrogenitus, "πίνακι" (85, 1).²⁶ The purpose of the forger was to emphasize the antiquity of his supposed

original, which was proven for him by the use of the primitive alphabet, "litteris Punicis" (1, 3; 3, 1-2; 12, 12; 101; 33), "litterarum Phœnicum" (2, 3), and of an old-fashioned writing material. For the same reason it is stated in an Egyptian inscription in the temple of Dendara that what is clearly an apocryphal sketch of a building was written in ancient script on parchment—which antedated the use of papyrus in Egypt²⁷—and the Cretans, in disputing the claims of the Phœnicians as the inventors of the alphabet, alleged that the invention was Cretan, where they were first written on palm-leaves, "ἐν φοινίκων πετάλοις."²⁸ The testimony of Galen in regard to manuscripts of Hippocrates preserved "ἐν ταῖς φιλύραις,"²⁹ Ulpian's (d. 228) "volumina" in "philyra aut in tilia,"³⁰ the "philuram calculatorem"³¹ and "ex tilia"³² of inscriptions; (108), all attest the use of the bast of linden wood as a writing material, somewhat contemporaneous with the dates both of the Greek Dictys and the Latin translation. In the first part of the fifth century the "libri in philyræ cortice subnotati" were spoken of as "rare" by Martianus Capella;³³ Photius, the teacher of Arethas, had only the very indefinite information that the linden tree had bast very similar to the papyrus

²⁷ R. Pietschmann, *Sammlung bibliothekswiss. Arbeiten*, Heft VIII, 112.

²⁸ Suidas, s. v. φοινικῶν γράμματα; cf. R. Garnett, *Library*, N. S. IV, 225; R. M. Burrows, *The Discoveries in Crete*, 64-65.

²⁹ *Med. gr.*, ed. Kuhn, XVIII, 2, p. 630; adopting reading suggested by Birt, *Die Buchrolle in der Kunst*, 21, n. 1; cf. Dziatzko, *l. c.*, 44, n. 4.

³⁰ *Dig.*, 32, 52, 1; adopting Dziatzko's suggestion that the "aut" before "philyra" be dropped (*l. c.*, 77, n. 3), avoiding thus the difficulty of making a distinction between "philyra" and "tilia," noticed by Marquardt, *Das Privatleben der Römer*,² 800, n. 2.

³¹ CIL., VI, 2, 10229; cf. Cagnat, *Cours d'Epigraphie latine*, 1889, 251, 292. On the structure of linden-bast as writing material, cf. Wiesner, *Sitzungsber. der Wiener Akad. Phil. Hist. Klasse*, 126, VIII, 11, who has shown that certain manuscripts have been wrongly considered to be of linden bast paper (1 ff.). At the same time nothing warrants Landwehr's statement that the phrase of Ulpian is "eine juristische Tüftelei, die nur ja nicht irgend eine Möglichkeit ausser acht lassen will"; ALL., VI, 225, a too skeptical point of view adopted by W. Schubart, *Das Buch bei den Gr. u. Rom.*, 2-3.

³² CIL., II, 4125.

³³ 2, 136 (p. 39).

²³ *Berliner philol. Wochenschrift*, 1900, 1295-6. The reading "ἐν Σιγίω" of the Greek Dictys [*l. c.*, I, 91; cf. 95, and 55 n.) demolishes the arguments of both sides, proving on one hand that the "σιγῇ" of Malalas is a corruption (Griffin, 79 n.); and on the other, that it was not due to a misunderstanding of the latin "in Sigeo."

²⁴ Krumbacher, *Gesch. der byzant. Lit.*, 846, n. 2.

²⁵ R. Heinzel, *Sitzungsber. der Wiener Akad. Phil. Klasse*, 126, I, 13, 61; W. Foerster, *Rom. Forsch.*, XXII, 2, 32 ff., 46; cf. *Byz. Zeit.* III, 520; IV, 530.

²⁶ On the use of the singular, cf. *Iliad*, VI, 168, and the interpretations of Dziatzko, *Untersuchungen über ausgewählte Kapitel des antiken Buchwesens*, 12; Birt, *Centralbl. f. Bibliotheksw.*, XVII, 149.

of a book-roll.³⁴ On the other hand, the ancient use of wooden tablets, for one purpose or another, was known to almost the present day,³⁵ and was unquestionably prevalent in the tenth century and known to Arethas and Isaak.³⁶

Again there is a possibility that the idea of bronze tablets was suggested to Arethas by the custom of engraving laws on bronze tablets,³⁷ but the only literary work,³⁸ noted as being engraved on metal, was Hesiod's *Works and Days*, which was shown to Pausanias, engraven on lead, at Hippocrene.³⁹ In fact it may be almost accepted as a canon of criticism in the study of literary forgeries, that the more durable—and generally the more costly—the material on which the original is said to be found, the more recent the forgery. In the Egyptian romance of Setna, written in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus (285–247 B. C.), the secrets of Thoth-Hermes are found written on a papyrus roll;⁴⁰ the Pythagorean books said to have been found in the tomb of Numa in 150 B. C. were written on the same material,⁴¹ the geographical romance of Antonius Diogenes (c. 100 A. D.) on cypress tablets,⁴² while the tablet,

reported by Plutarch to have been found in a tomb in the time of Agesilaus, was of bronze;⁴³ Lucian has his fun with bronze tablets, which were buried, and then dug up by the roguish hero of his *Πσευδομάντις*;⁴⁴ Pausanias relates in the second century the revelation in 350 B. C. of a zinc tablet, containing the mysteries of the greater gods;⁴⁵ the original of the Byzantine *κυρπιδης* attributed to Hermes, was written on an iron slab;⁴⁶ an angel presents silver tablets containing prophecies to the Carmelite Cyril (1175);⁴⁷ a late medieval work, attributed to Hermes owed its title "Tabula smaragdina" to the tablet of emerald on which it was engraved;⁴⁸ and finally the Mormon bible was dug up by Joseph Smith,

⁴³ *De genio Soer.*, p. 577 E. Cf. also his account of a collection of secrets written on parchment, dug up at Carthage; *De fac. in orb. lun.*, 26, p. 942 C.

⁴⁴ C. 10.

⁴⁵ IV, 26, 6. On its source in the *Μεσσηνιακά* of Rhianus (B. C. 200), cf. Susemihl, *Geschichte der griech. Litt. in der Alexandrinerzeit*, I, 405, n. 157b.

⁴⁶ Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca Græca*, I, 70. H. Haupt, *Philologus*, XLVIII, 373.

⁴⁷ *Acta SS. Martii*, I, 498, 500; *Maii*, VII, 100. An angel only shows the scribe the tablet, of which the material is not denoted, from which he is to copy the Gospels of Kildare, in the account of Gerald de Barri (1186), *Topograph. Hib. Opera*, ed. Dimock, v, 123; cf. Berthelot, *La Chimie au Moyen-Âge*, III, 120. It must be noted that the fiction of tablets does not appear in the accounts of the originals of *Perlesvaus*, written by an angel (*Perlesvaus*, p. 1), or of the *Grand St. Graal* (ed. Hucher, II, 9, 439, 441), written by Christ, or in the book of wonders sent from heaven to Brandan (Schroeder, *Sanct Brandan*, vii). According to an interpolated passage in a sixteenth century manuscript of the life of a sixth century St. Caillin (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*, VIII, 211), an angel dictated to him a history of Ireland (D'Arbois de Jubainville, *Le cycle mythologique irlandais*, 82).

⁴⁸ On different traditions of its discovery, cf. Kopp, *Beiträge zur Gesch. der Chemie*, I, 370. Steinschneider was not acquainted with any Arabic source; *Sitzungsb. der Wien. Akad. Phil. Hist. Klasse*, 151, I, 26. On the tradition of finding the works of Hermes in various forms, cf. Berthelot, *La Chimie au Moyen-Âge*, I, 242; II, 311, 328; III, 120. The "laminæ plumbeæ" secretly immured with the Seven Sleepers, telling of the cause of their martyrdom, found in different versions of their hagiography (*Acta SS. Julii*, VI, 382, 386, 390, 391, 394) seems to be the first of a class of forgeries that does not call for treatment here (cf. Wattenbach, I, c., 50). Delehay (I, c., 101, n. 4) has noted how tradition enhances the material value of inscriptions; stone becomes bronze, etc.

³⁴ *Lexicon*, ed. Porson, II, 640: "φιλυρα. φυτὸν ἐχὼν φλοιδὸν βέβλου παπύρω ὁμοιον"; with corrections suggested by Dziatzko, I, c., 33, n. 2.

³⁵ Marquardt, I, c.; Dziatzko, I, c., 16 ff.; Wattenbach, *Schriftwesen im Mittelalter*, 91 ff.

³⁶ Jebb, Note to Soph. *Trachinæ*, 683.

³⁷ Hübner, *Rom. Epigraphie*, in I. Müller, *Handb. der klass. Alterth.*, I², 631.

³⁸ The tablets of thuya, on which were written the Gospel of St. Matthew found with the body of St. Barnabas (*Acta SS. Junii*, II, 446 D) was not chosen by its author on account of its durability and preciousness (cf. Theophr. *H. P.*, 5, 3, 7; Plin., *H. N.*, XIII, 30; *Apocal.*, XVIII, 20); but because it was miraculously saved from the funeral fire, like the body of the saint (I, c., 440 B); in an earlier account the Gospel, of which the material is not mentioned, is buried with the few remains of the body left by the fire (429; cf. 417).

³⁹ IX, 31, 4. Cf. Dziatzko, in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-En. cyclopædie*, II, 564–565.

⁴⁰ W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Egyptian Fairy Tales*, II, 111 (cf. 116 "steles"), 131. On date, cf. I, c., 141; Brugsch Bey, *Rev. archéol.*, 1867, II, 162; Revillout, I, c., 1879, II, 18. ⁴¹ Livy, XL, 29; Pliny, *H. N.*, XIII, 84; cf. Dziatzko, *Unters.*, 93. On modern discoveries of papyri, in Roman tombs, Birt, *Buchrolle*, 7, n. 2.

⁴² E. Rohde, *Der griechische Roman*, 277.

⁴³ *Erotici scriptores Græci*, ed. Hercher, I, 237–239.

engraved on golden plates,⁴⁹ through the revelations of an angel.

Arethas in stating that the annals of Dictys were found, as written, on bronze tablets, which were copied and transferred into books, makes the same distinction between two kinds of writing material as is found in the account of George Synkellos, based upon the pseudo-Manetho, of how the works of Thoth-Hermes, originally inscribed in a sacred language in hieroglyphics on pillars (στῆλαι), were translated into Greek, in hieroglyphic script, preserved in books in the sanctuary of the temples of the Egyptian.⁵⁰ Of this process through which the *Ephemeris* passed there is no sign elsewhere. Surely the Latin translator would have translated by "Pugillares" or "tabulas," "σύνικες" "δελτοί," if it had occurred in his Greek original. The peculiarly Latin word "volumina" in the passage in the *Prologus*, "de toto bello decem volumina in tilias digessit," does not seem to be able to have any other meaning but that of the division of the work into parts, a use of the word peculiarly Augustan, becoming rarer with succeeding generations of writers.⁵¹ The writer of the *Epistle* speaks of the original work as "libros ex philyra," using "libros" in its more general sense of "book," "volume," in which writing material made out of linden-bast would have been properly included, according to the specific statements of Galen and Ulpian,⁵² but

⁴⁹ W. A. Linn, *The Story of the Mormons*, 23 ff. The author of the most recent neurotic gospel has obviated the difficulty of a material original of her revelation, by making herself the amanuensis of God (F. W. Peabody, *Complete Exposure of Eddyism and Christian Science*, Boston, 1904, p. 7).

⁵⁰ Ed. Bonn, I, 72, 14 ff. The process of translating the original sacred language, corresponds to the additional process denoted in the *prologus* "Nero iussit in Græcum sermonem ista transferri" and "Dictys peritus vocis et litterarum Phœnicum," although there is not the same need in the case of Dictys, and Dr. Griffin has properly rejected it (9, n. 1), although the fiction of a Hebrew original is found in certain Christian apocryphal texts, e. g. *Liber Sapientiae* (André, *Les Apocryphes de l'ancien testament*, 319); *Acta Pilati* (Harnack, l. c.; H. Peter, *Neue Jahrb. f. d. k. Alterth.*, XIX, 23).

⁵¹ One of the chief sources of Philostratus, in his *Life of Apollonius*, was "τὰς δέλτους τῶν ὑπομνημάτων" of Damis (ed. Kayser, 3, 33), showing a somewhat contemporaneous use of the word.

⁵² Landwehr, l. c., 240-241.

not of tablets of linden-wood.⁵³ In no case is there any evidence for the correction of the Latin text "tabulas" for "in tilias," as suggested by Patzig,⁵⁴ and accepted by Griffin (33, n. 1). In the *Epistle* "volumina" is used in the same sense as in the *Prologus*, and its author has gone further in dividing his "ten" volumina into two main sections, "priorum quinque voluminum, quæ bello contracta gesta sunt,"⁵⁵ and the "residua quinque de reditu Græcorum," a division into pentades according to the subject for which he had the model of Livy;⁵⁶ the Greek historians, Diodorus,⁵⁷ Dion Cassius and Josephus,⁵⁸ whose works are arranged in pentades neither purposed nor made this arrangement according to subject. Is not this a further proof of the authorship of the *Epistle* by the Roman translator, who made this addition against the authority of the *Prologus*, which speaks of only "sex volumina" according to all the manuscript evidence?⁵⁹ The use of "libellus" in the *Epistle* is again almost peculiar to Latin of the fourth century in the meaning of the division of a work, a synonym for "book."⁶⁰

In a work written in English it would be well to refer to "Hody" instead of "Hodius" (26, n. 3). Dr. Griffin speaks of "the original Malalas" (36), without at all considering the first edition, known to us by the use made of it by Evagrius, a point clearly made out by the researches of Shestakov, Brooks and Gleye.⁶¹ Nor does he seem to have accepted Gleye's suggestion that the source of the *Troica* of Tzetzes was this same more complete edition (30, 72).⁶² Similarly

⁵³ Cf. Notes 21 and 22.

⁵⁴ Birt, *Das Antike Buchwesen*, 98.

⁵⁵ *Byzant. Zeit.*, I, 590.

⁵⁶ Teuffel, *Rom. Lit.*, ¶ 257, 11. On a division into parts of other Latin works, Landwehr, l. c., 221-2; Dziatzko, l. c., 109.

⁵⁷ I, 4.

⁵⁸ C. Wachsmuth, *Rh. Mus.*, XLVI, 329 ff.; for other divisions in Greek historians cf. Birt, *Das ant. Buchwesen*, 34, 35, cf. 114, 117, 240; Rohde, *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1882, 1544.

⁵⁹ One is tempted to correct the impossible construction of Arethas, "ἐξ ὧν καὶ βιβλίος" into "ὧ καὶ ἐξ βιβλίου κατετέθησαν συμφώνως κατὰ πάντα Ὀμήρω"; this division would have at least the merit of corresponding in some way to the 48 books of Homer, and would also confirm the MSS. reading "sex."

⁶⁰ Landwehr, l. c., 244.

⁶¹ *Byz. Zeit.*, V, 422.

⁶² L. c., 427.

(46, n. 2) he has failed to note various studies on the importance of the Slavic translation for the Greek text, particularly Gleye's use of it in his reconstruction of the *Troica* of Malalas.⁶³ The tradition of the "portraits," so characteristic of the *Troica* of Byzantine writers, was continued in the lives of certain saints in the *Synaxaria* of the Greek Church, features borrowed from manuals of painting, in which the Byzantine artists found the traditional appearance of these saints perpetuated.⁶⁴ This feature does not appear in Occidental hagiography,⁶⁵ and only appears in the late medieval translations into Latin and the vernacular tongues of the Arabic work of Mubaschschir (1053-4), of which the latest version was the *Dictes and Sayings of the Philosophers* of Caxton.⁶⁶ Burton⁶⁷ has noted the Oriental preference for joined eye-brows (53, n. 2); but Liebrecht⁶⁸ and others⁶⁹ have collected evidence which shows that this taste is not peculiar to the East.

Doubtlessly owing to an earlier printing of his text than is implied by the title-page, Dr. Griffin has not been able to make use of the text of John of Antioch found in Lampros's *Néos 'Ελληνισμῆμαν*, I (1904), or Büttner-Wobst's and de Boor's editions of the works of Constantine Porphyrogenitos. The Vienna manuscript containing the chronicle of Johannes Sikeliota should be properly noted as "Vind. Hist. Graec. 99" (83), and the correct reading, in agreement with the *Ephemeris*, of the name of Hecuba's father is "Dymas."⁷⁰ The agreement of the fragments of the Greek Dictys with Septimius in the account of the negotiations of Achilles for the hand of Polyxena,⁷¹ confirms Patzig in thinking that the different account in Malalas is due to the continual attempt to eulogize Achilles,⁷² a view which Dr. Griffin does not seem

to be willing to accept entirely (84, n. 3); although the same fragments have played havoc with a number of points in the same critic's reconstruction of the work of Sisypchos of Cos, and his unshaken opinion that John of Antioch made use both of Malalas and a Greek Dictys.⁷³ Future discussions of the source of Kedrenos will have to take into account the first version of the chronicle of Malalas, on which Dr. Griffin has not touched (90 ff., 104).

There are other details which would call for comment if space allowed, but they are of minor importance, and do not reflect on the thoroughness with which Dr. Griffin has performed his work, and one must look forward to the publication of his chapter on "The Origin of Dares," even if the later forgery does not present the interest of Dictys. It is only with the completion of critical studies on these two worthless literary productions, that one can work backward to the Greek cyclic epic, and forward to the medieval literature on the subject.

GEORGE L. HAMILTON.

University of Michigan.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Der Schimmelreiter. Novelle von THEODOR STORM. Edited with Introduction, Exercises, Notes, and Vocabulary by JOHN MACGILLIVRAY and EDWARD J. WILLIAMSON. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1908.

The editors of this book have placed American teachers and students under obligation for a useful text of one of the most charming tales of that master of modern German prose, Theodor Storm. Those who know and admire the essentially lyric genius of this author recall the simple outline and the sombre colors of his Schleswig-Holstein home, in such striking contrast with the fullness and poetic suggestiveness of his works. For Storm the brown heath, the gray sand-spit, the stretch of

⁶³ L. c., 451.

⁶⁴ *Synaxarium ecclesiae Constantinopolitanae, Propylæum ad Acta SS.*, Nov., p. lxii.

⁶⁵ H. Delehaye, l. c., LXXIV, 98.

⁶⁶ F. Boll, *Anglia*, XXI, 225, n. 5.

⁶⁷ *Arabian Nights*, I, 156, 227; III, 255.

⁶⁸ *Germania*, v, 123; *Gött. gel. Anz.*, 1873, 1479.

⁶⁹ G. P. Krapp, *M. L. N.*, XIX, 235; Hamilton, l. c., xx, 80.

⁷⁰ Gleye, *B. Z.*, v, 453-454.

⁷¹ L. c., II, 21 ff.

⁷² *B. Z.*, XII, 235-236, 244; and now *B. Z.*, XVII, 384.

⁷³ Besides those noted by Griffin, 85-6, cf. *B. Z.*, XII, 236, 245, 257; XIII, 43; and finally *B. Z.*, XVII, 384, 491-3.

ocean below and the expanse of sky overhead are the fundamental tones of a music as varied and as complex as the ever-shifting moods of the human heart. In his lyric poems and in his short stories the appreciation of the infinite suggestiveness of these tones is quite as characteristic of Storm's art as are the more obvious lines of his sketches of human life.

Our editors have chosen an admirable specimen of the poet's craftsmanship. It is an unpretentious story of the peasant life of the North German coast, presenting to us with wonderful vividness a picture of the hardships, ingenuity, success, and failure of a modern Faust, the dike-builder who reclaims for the good of the community a waste strip of sea-marsh—only to incur the suspicion and hostility of his narrow-minded and superstitious neighbors and with his wife and child to be swept away by a calamity closely connected with the great enterprise of his life.

The editorial *Introduction* devotes eight pages to a resumé of the essential features of Storm's life and works and four pages of German to a sketch of the plot of the story, to a critical estimate of the work, and to a general evaluation of the poet. Following the hundred and fifty-three pages of clearly printed text come thirty-seven pages of notes, nineteen pages of exercises for translation, based upon the text of the story, sixteen pages of *Fragen* touching the events of the action, the *Schimmelreiter* as a work of art, and the poet, and two pages of *Themata zu deutschen Aufsätzen*. The vocabulary at the end of the volume of three hundred and fifty pages is unfortunately confined to the text of the story, leaving thus undefined a considerable number of German words, introduced by the editors, as indicated in the foregoing. While the present writer believes the special vocabulary in a book of this kind to be pedagogically bad, since it discourages sight reading and the early intelligent use of an adequate dictionary, he would emphasize the need of completeness, as the least that may reasonably be expected in a feature demanded, not by editorial conviction, but by the commercial instinct of publishing houses.

The editorial comment is on the whole terse, clear, and appropriate. Real appreciation of the genius of the author and of the peculiar beauty and strength of the work under consideration finds

expression in a style calculated to stimulate independent thought and appreciation in the reader. The brevity of the introduction suggests the wise editorial reserve, which is impossible without some faith in the intellect and imagination of the public. But conciseness is not always compatible with completeness of statement. This may occasionally account for passages that challenge objection or even contradiction. So while it is true, for instance, that critics should be allowed a wide latitude in matters so subjective, as is the individual judgment of the relative merits of different lyric poets, it seems fair to doubt the propriety—*a*) of coupling Mörike and Geibel as similarly gifted yrists; *b*) of affirming of both a successful rivalry with Goethe, which even the most enthusiastic admirers of Mörike would scarcely claim for Geibel; and *c*) of comparing Storm to Geibel, by way of compliment to the Husum poet.

An occasional infelicity or inaccuracy of expression in the German part of the Introduction should be noted, as, for instance, "Auch *enthüllt* der Dichter eine genaue Kenntnis der menschlichen Natur" instead of "Auch *zeigt* d. D." etc. (p. xvii); "Mörike und Geibel, die *Goethe* . . nicht weit zurückstehen" instead of "M. u. G., die hinter (gegen) Goethe . . zurückstehen" (p. xviii); "worin er den Rang *mit den Besten* streitig macht" instead of "worin er *den Besten* den Rang streitig macht" (or "worin er *den Besten* ebenbürtig ist") (*ibid.*), "indem er ihn oft in festgeschlossener Technik übertrifft," instead of "... an f. Technik" . . (*ibid.*); "seine *eigene*, poetische Worte" instead of "seine *eigenen*, poetischen Worte" (*ibid.*, footnote 2).

The Notes are generally well conceived and adapted to the purpose of explaining real difficulties of construction or allusion. They occasionally include, however, the superfluous translation of individual words explained in the vocabulary. Such are, *e. g.*, *berichten*, *beabsichtige*, *längst* (3, 1), *Obmann* (39, 11), *haschen* (120, 16). The systematic attempt of the editors to enrich the vocabulary of the learner by the suggestion of synonyms and antonyms and to secure attention to vital details by means of skilful cross-reference is wholly commendable. Not equally satisfactory in every case is the choice of the suggested synonym, etc. So, *e. g.*, it is quite misleading to

mention (5, 28) *Gestalt* instead of *Gespenst* or *Spuk* in connection with *Erscheinung* of the text. Various other minor defects of the Notes may be summarized as follows: The expressions *Euren dummen Drachen* (8, 26 and 28), *frug* (11, 5), *wieder* (13, 11), the subjunctive *könne* (73, 16), and Storm's use of phrases like *nach dort* (48, 7 and elsewhere) are sufficiently peculiar to call for editorial comment; the plural *Teleskopen* (10, 2) should be designated as dialectic and contrasted with the regular form; the note to *Bussolen* (10, 1) is unintelligible with its *Landstecherskompassse* instead of *Landmesserkompassse*; the note to the complementary infinitives *ritzen* and *prickeln* (10, 7) should also explain their technical meaning in this context; the note to *Deichgraf* (14, 2) "regularly declined weak; otherwise colloquial or dialectical" applies to 138, 11; it does not apply to 14, 2: the connection shows that in the sentence, "Du kannst es ja vielleicht zum Deichgraf bringen" the word *Deichgraf* here designates the title or office and not a concrete holder of the office; as such it is the regular uninflected form; *sie angeknabbert* (15, 20) is explained as meaning *an sie gefressen*, which is certainly not correct German. Something like *sie angefressen* (or *sie angenagt*) seems to have been in the mind of the editors; the student would infer from the note to 29, 25 that *am Boden* is less usual than *auf dem Boden*, whereas the real distinction is that the former is the older and vaguer and the latter the more precise designation of place; *Vergiss er* (23, 23) is not sufficiently explained by stating that it is the "second person singular imperative, the *er* being superfluous;" the note should call attention to the cross between the third person singular of the hortatory subjunctive and the second person singular of the imperative, presented in this form of address; *um* in the phrase *um zehn Jahre weiter* (87, 16) is a preposition measuring a difference of time and not an adverb meaning *ungefähr*; the different forms of address, used by different social ranks or classes when conversing with each other, should be explained in a future note to 101, 24 and 26.

A useful discussion of the principal points of German as distinguished from English word-order is prefixed to the Exercises for Translation. The statement of the editors (II, [2]) that "the

separable particle in compound verbs in a simple tense . . . is inseparable" needs modification in the interest of clearness. The general word-order scheme given on page 197 would be more helpful if arranged so as to include concrete illustrative examples.

The English exercises are idiomatic, conceived in the spirit of the story, and yet sufficiently different from the text to afford excellent discipline in assimilating the German vocabulary.

The *Fragen* touch all the chief events in the story and in the life of the poet. They are well conceived and so searching as to compel the student who would answer them to scan attentively and thoughtfully the whole work. They might be used to good purpose as the starting point of a series of written reports upon successive parts of the tale. Several slips in the phrasing of these questions should receive attention in a second edition: For *ist* read *wird* (213, 30); for *konnte* read *könne* or *könnte* (214, 7); for *die* read *der* (215, 1); for *Wo* read *Wohin* (216, 8, 226, 9 and 226, 16); for *Worin* read *Worein* (216, 9); for *einen* read *ein* (216, 19); for *Besuch* read *Besuchs* (216, 23); for *dritten* read *drittem* (216, 28); for *Anschaue* read *Zuschauer* (217, 6) as the more usual form; for *Warum so?* read simply *Warum?* or *Warum denn?* (218, 10-11 and 222, 29); for *dieselbe(n)* read *sie* (218, 28, 219, 14 and 25, and 223, 27); for *gegen dieselben* read *dagegen* (221, 3 and 4); for *denselben* ("Wie trat Hauke denselben entgegen?") read *ihnen* ("Wie trat ihnen Hauke entgegen?") (221, 4); for *sich hineinmischen* read *sich einmischen* (219, 9 and 10); for *endete* read *beendete* (*brachte zu Ende*) (221, 6); for "als Oktober wieder da war" read "als der Oktober wieder da war" (222, 4); for *Wohltätiger* read *Wohltäter* (225, 20); for *stirnäckig* read *stiernackig* (225, 23, 25, 27, 29, and 33); for *wenn so* read *in diesem Fall* (225, 34); for *auf diejenigen, die ihnen überwachsen sind* read, for the sake of terseness, *auf die ihnen Überwachsenen* (225, 35); for "Anpassung des Stils der Stimmung oder dem Inhalt" read "A. d. S. an die Stimmung oder den Inhalt" (227, 13); for *leaving examination* read *finals* (*final examination*) (228, 7); for "Welche politische Ereignisse" read "Welche politischen E." (228, 19-20); for "Die verschiedenen Auftreten des

Eschenbaums und deren Zweck" read "Das wiederholte Auftreten d. E. und dessen Zweck" (229, 18).

The book is excellent in point of paper, type, and printing. But few misprints have been discovered: A comma should be inserted after the word *Notes* on the title page; quotation marks should be used before the word *Man* and after the final word *ist*, page xix, ll. 14 and 30; for *älesl* read *alles* (8, 2); for *ihn* read *ihm* (175, 15); for *kamen* read *kämen* (191, 5).

A clearly printed map of Schleswig-Holstein and also one of the conjectural topography of the story, given on page xx, are an important aid to the intelligent reading of the story.

The hope and confidence that the sale of this pioneer American text of the *Schimmelreiter* will warrant an early new edition of the book is the occasion of the somewhat detailed review of it herewith presented.

STARR WILLARD CUTTING.

The University of Chicago.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

Molière et l'Espagne, par GUILLAUME HUSZÁR.
Paris: Champion, 1907, pp. ix + 332 in 8°.

In the present work, M. Huszár has applied to Molière the same critical method that he employed in his well known work on Corneille.¹ Now, as before, he has been preceded by M. Martinenche, who has been working in the same field.² So in a discussion of M. Huszár's book a brief comparison with that of M. Martinenche will not be out of place, and the comparison is rendered all the more interesting by the fact that the two critics arrive at different conclusions. M. Martinenche has aimed above all to throw new light on the Spanish sources of Molière. For him Molière's superiority to his originals is unquestionable, and he never fails to reassert Molière's

originality whenever it may be called in question. M. Huszár, on the other hand, has not limited himself to a study of sources, but has tried to revise the verdict of the critics concerning Molière and to establish his proper place in general literature, or as he puts it *la littérature européenne*.

M. Huszár's work divides itself naturally into three parts; a summary of the critical literature dealing with Molière (which serves as an introduction), a study of Molière's Spanish sources, and finally a critical evaluation of Molière's work. The author shows in his introduction that many of those who have hitherto discussed Molière's relation to Spain have allowed their judgments to be influenced by considerations entirely foreign to literary criticism. The Spaniards themselves have taken little part in the discussion compared with the Italian, German, and French critics. Italians, such as Tiraboschi and Riccoboni, have tried to prove that Molière is indebted to Italy rather than Spain for his plots. The German critics, especially Schack and Klein, have been unjust to Molière because of their dislike for the principles of the French classic drama. French critics have been actuated by patriotism to exalt Molière at the expense of his foreign models, justifying on the ground of his superior genius whatever borrowings they were forced to admit. Among the worst offenders in this regard are the editors of the official definitive edition of Molière, Despois and Mesnard; and M. Huszár is at times very severe in his attacks on them. He considers himself in a position to discuss the question dispassionately, as he is a Hungarian with no personal attachment to either country. For two critics, however, he expresses the highest admiration; for M. Brune-tière, whose writings inspired him to undertake the present study, and for Sr. Menéndez y Pelayo, whose impartiality is above reproach.

In the second part of the work, every play of Molière is taken up and discussed with reference to the Spanish drama. This exclusive attention to Spanish sources would not be justifiable in a book of the scope of M. Huszár's, were it not that he considers that Molière was little affected by any other foreign influence. The only plays where Spanish influence is not visible are the *Jalousie du Barbouillé* and the *Fourberies de Scapin*, which are drawn from Italian sources.

¹ P. Corneille et le théâtre espagnole, Paris, 1903.

² E. Martinenche, *La comedia espagnole en France de Hardy à Racine*, Paris, 1900. E. Martinenche, *Molière et le théâtre espagnol*, Paris, 1906.

Other instances of Italian influence are generally disposed of by proving that the Italian models are imitations from the Spanish; e. g., the *Médecin volant* is taken from Dominique's *Medico volante*, which is derived from Lope's *Acero de Madrid*.

In the long list of Spanish plays which Molière has imitated, or in which one may discover striking analogies to certain scenes of his, M. Huszár presents very few facts that have not been brought out by M. Martinenche and others. In a way this is an advantage, for we feel sure we are dealing with accepted facts when we come to consider the justice of the conclusions drawn from them by M. Huszár.

To sum up the Spanish influence on Molière, we find that his ideas as to the doctors, the *précieuses*, the hypocrites, and the jealous husbands had all been expressed in Spain, that almost all of his plots have some element borrowed from Spain, and that three of his plays, *La Princesse d'Élide*, *Don Juan*, and *l'École des maris* may certainly be classified as adaptations of Spanish originals, while there is a strong probability that the same is true of *Dom Garcie de Navarre*, *Sganarelle*, and the *Fâcheux*. Molière has not allowed himself to be dominated by his originals, however, and has borrowed only what suited his purposes. If any of his plays are failures they are precisely those in which he comes nearest to surrendering his personality by following closely a foreign model.

In the concluding chapters, where M. Huszár tries to determine Molière's proper place in the world's literature, he begins by comparing the French dramatist with Lope de Vega. Molière invented the French *comédie*, Lope invented the Spanish *comedia*. Which author has accomplished the greater task? M. Huszár does not hesitate to give the palm to Lope, on the ground that his *comedias* represent a greater advance on the *entremeses* and *autos* of his predecessors than the *comédies* of Molière do on the productions of such men as Desmarets, Scarron, and Pierre Corneille.

Granted Lope's superiority as an innovator, it remains to be seen whether the *comedia* as introduced by him and continued by Tirso, Alarcón, Calderón, and others is superior to the *comédie* as represented by Molière. It is often urged against the *comedia* that it usually consists of

little more than a complicated plot, while Molière devotes himself to the delineation of character. M. Huszár protests against this generalisation and cites a number of *comedias* that are real *comédies de caractère*. After studying Lope's *Acero de Madrid*, Tirso's *Burlador de Sevilla*, and Alarcón's *Verdad sospechosa*, to mention only a few, one can scarcely escape the conviction that the Spaniards have produced types more lifelike than Molière's Harpagon and Tartuffe, for example, whatever defects may exist in the Spanish plays. Again, Alarcón and Tirso show themselves able to depict character without neglecting the plot, as Molière sometimes does.

As to the exactness with which Molière observed and described his contemporaries, he falls behind the Spaniards, whose greatest weakness, perhaps, is their strong local color, the *goût de terroir*, which renders them so hard for foreigners or even Spaniards of a later age to appreciate. In refutation of the claim that Molière has given a complete picture of society, M. Huszár calls attention to the fact that the common people, the financiers, the lawyers, or to descend somewhat, the *entremetteur*, the *courtisane*, and the *chevalier d'industrie*, do not appear in his works. But they are all represented on the Spanish stage.

The Spaniards had a strong sense of humor; the quality that made Cervantes famous was not possessed by him alone. Molière is never humorous in the broad sense of the word. His nearest approach to it is his *esprit gaulois*, which is often too strong for any but a French palate and at other times he falls into mere buffoonery and horse-play.

To summarize M. Huszár's conclusions, which he develops by a train of close reasoning supported by numerous examples, the Spaniards are superior to Molière in the fertility of their inventive genius, as shown in their complicated plots and in the variety of the characters brought upon the stage; furthermore they have a strong sense of humor, which the French lack. They are equal to Molière in the exactness with which they portray their contemporaries. They share with Molière such weaknesses as the repetition of conventional types and factitious endings. Molière is superior in the depth of his philosophical observations and in his clear and logical style.

The relative merits being so nearly equal in

each case, how are we to explain Molière's success and the oblivion into which the Spanish dramatists have fallen? M. Huszár replies:

"Le succès de l'œuvre de Molière, nous l'attribuons, au moins, en partie, à l'universalité de l'esprit français; sa comédie a bénéficié des qualités de cet esprit que le labeur commun d'une foule de grands écrivains a rendu si apte à concevoir toute pensée et à la formuler de manière à la rendre intelligible à tous. . . . Quand on compare Molière à des dramaturges d'autre race, il est juste de considérer les avantages en possession desquels le mit sa naissance: Lope et ses disciples au contraire déployaient des qualités qui tiraient toute leur valeur d'elles-mêmes. Nous donnons donc à ce parallèle cette conclusion qui ne nous paraît pas paradoxale: si l'œuvre de Molière eut une destinée plus glorieuse que celle des Espagnols, il le doit presque autant à sa qualité de Français qu'à son propre génie."³

Personally the reviewer can subscribe to this opinion only with reserve. M. Huszár should have named a few of that "*foule de grands écrivains*" who had imparted to French style its lucidity and logical sequence. It is agreed that these qualities explain to a certain extent Molière's success, but it does not follow that he inherited them from his predecessors. Molière and his contemporaries built up the literary tradition which has made French style a model of clearness.

It does not seem to have occurred to M. Huszár that the political development of France and of Spain has affected the popularity of their respective literatures abroad. When a nation is strong politically the attention it attracts along all lines contributes in no slight degree to the vogue of its literature. During the period of Spain's political supremacy the number of persons familiar with its language and customs made the diffusion of its literature easy. The same causes conspired later to spread the knowledge of French literature. In more recent times Germany's political rise has brought with it an increased interest in German literature.

M. Huszár's discussion of originality in his final chapter has not the charm of novelty. The position that an author is justified in taking an old idea if he can impart new force to it by stamping it with the mark of his own genius is hardly disputed now. To the English-speaking public, Shakespeare's superiority over Molière

scarcely admits of discussion. As to Dante and Cervantes, it is evident that they had more creative genius than Molière, but, as M. Huszár himself observes elsewhere, this is not the only point to be considered. It is something of a surprise to see Balzac placed in such illustrious company, but this is a question of taste which does not call for discussion.

M. Huszár's book is well written, his reasoning is sound on the whole, and his knowledge of his subject most thorough. His work is a valuable contribution to comparative literature.

J. A. RAY.

U. S. Naval Academy.

SCIENTIFIC GERMAN.

Introduction to Scientific German. Air, Water, Light, and Heat. Eight Lectures on Experimental Chemistry. By Dr. REINHART BLOCHMANN, Professor of the University of Königsberg. Edited with Notes and Vocabulary by FREDERICK WILLIAM MEISNEST, Ph. D. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1906.

A German Science Reader, with Notes and Vocabulary. By WILLIAM H. WAIT, Ph. D. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1907.

An introductory text for a class devoted primarily to scientific German should be written in comparatively simple German, and should contain matter of general interest to most of the students. Physics and chemistry, above all other sciences, will appeal in some degree to practically every member of such a class. An excellent book with which to begin a course in scientific German will, therefore, be one which presents in clear and simple language the most important facts of the two sciences mentioned.

Such a book Dr. Meisnest has given us in his edition of eight popular lectures delivered some ten years ago by Professor Blochmann at Königsberg—lectures devoted respectively to (1) a general introduction in which is explained the difference between physical and chemical changes, the characteristics of solids, fluids, and gases, the distinction between alchemy and chemistry, and the

³ P. 297.

structure of all matter from about seventy-eight elements, (2) air, (3) water, (4) carbon dioxide, (5) combustion, (6) incomplete combustion, (7) work, heat, light, (8) slow combustion.

Blochmann's lectures are interesting not only because they take up the phenomena of daily life, but because they explain also the importance and the construction of various useful contrivances as the Bunsen burner, the gas-range, the Drummond calcium light, Davy's safety lamp for miners, the Fahrenheit, Réaumur, and Centigrade thermometers, the Welsbach light, the spectro-scope, and others. Finally, they trace the historical evolution from the old Greek philosophical systems through the mediæval theories of the "philosopher's stone" to the modern conception of scientific physics and chemistry. The text is supplied, moreover, with more than fifty drawings illustrating the experiments.

The style is, in the main, simple and concise. In about thirty places the substitution of a semicolon for an original comma would make clear a sentence which in the present form gives unnecessary difficulty to the beginner. Of misprints, less than half a dozen occur.

The editorial work has, on the whole, been carefully done. The Introduction takes up various "suggestions for the study of scientific German"—discussions on the German participial constructions, on the theory of word-composition, and on the method of acquiring a vocabulary. All these are helpful to the beginner in scientific German.

The Notes, although extending over only six pages, contain all the information necessary for understanding the references in the text. Some readers might object to the note to 24,7 that *man* is rarely translated by 'one.' Class-room experience with the book will show also that the insertion, either in the Notes at the back of the book, or in footnotes, of the chemical equations representing the reactions described in the German text, will be a great help in securing for the students a technical vocabulary.

The Vocabulary is to be particularly commended for its completeness and its excellent arrangement. Accented syllables, plural of nouns, vowel changes and other irregularities of verbs are indicated. Two definitions are to be corrected. Under *Bleioxyd* the subdivision *essig-*

saures Bleioxyd is given "carbonate of lead." This should evidently read "acetate of lead." Under *Kohlensäure* we find the definition "carbonic acid." This, though a literal translation of *Kohlensäure*, is open to objections. It should be given "carbonic acid gas" and the alternative definition "carbon dioxide"—a term generally used in English for the chemical compound CO_2 —should be added.

Blochmann's lectures, as edited by Dr. Meisner, are a welcome addition to our available texts for use in scientific German classes; as an introductory text for such classes this edition of lectures is unusually practical and successful.

Whereas in Blochmann the student is brought face to face with principles which apply to all sciences, in Wait's *Reader* he finds the general field of science presented by subjects. The six chapters deal respectively with Chemistry as taken from the German writer Gerlach, Physics by Sattler, Geology by Fraas, Mineralogy by Brauns, Astronomy by Möbius-Wislicenus, Anatomy by Rebmann. For purposes of correction and verification, the exact titles and dates of the works from which these chapters are taken should have been cited.

A new edition will make the *Reader* more serviceable. A number of misprints can easily be corrected. The table of elements on page 4 omits seven elements (of more or less importance) which are included in the table in Blochmann (published a year earlier than Wait)—gadolinium, krypton, neon, radium, terbium, thulium, xenon. The atomic weights given in the short table on page 117 differ from those given on page 4—in some cases by two or three points. Chlorine is given as 53.2 (evidently a misprint for 35.2).

The Notes extend over fifty-seven pages. Though they are written, as the editor states, "with a view to meeting conditions as they are, and not as they should be," one might gravely doubt whether the notes of a science reader are expected to inform a student that *vom* = *von dem* (note to 1, 1), that Berlin is the capital of Germany (80, 11), that Chili and Peru are countries in South America (80, 14), that Siberia is a Russian territory in Northern Asia (29, 1). In a note to 2, 5, is explained the method of trans-

lating the participial phrase. References to this explanation occur throughout the notes more than a hundred times. The fifty-seven pages of Notes could have been compressed by omitting elementary grammatical and geographical notes, by limiting the number of times that the same reference is cited, and by relegating to the Vocabulary many of the definitions now found in the Notes.

Several features of the Notes are to be commended—the explanations concerning the correct reading in German of various formulæ, and the explanations (page 210) of the relation between German and English geological and mineralogical terms. The lists, at the end of each chapter, of the important German words and phrases, with their pronunciation and definition, serve a good purpose.

The Vocabulary, so far as the English definitions are concerned, leaves little to be desired. The anatomical terms give most trouble. It might have been well, therefore, to give in the Vocabulary not only the generally accepted English term for a particular bone or muscle (for instance, "ethmoid bone" for *Siebbein*, "sphenoid bone" for *Keilbein*, "sagittal suture" for *Pfeilnaht*, "coracoid process" for *Rabenschnabelfortsatz*), but, in addition, the direct English definition or cognate of the German term (thus, sieve bone, wedge bone, arrow suture, raven's-beak process). The student would thus get a fairly definite idea of the position, shape, or function of a particular bone or muscle. In some cases the editor has followed this plan (thus, *Baekenzahn*, cheek tooth, molar).

In citing verbs, the editor has generally given the vowel changes of the preterite and past participle, and, in the case of irregular verbs, has given the parts in full. It is to be regretted that this principle has not been carried out consistently. Objection might also be raised against the method of giving verbs with separable prefixes thus: *abgehen* (-ging, -gegangen). The insertion of the hyphen before the preterite is misleading. Dr. Meisnest's plan of omitting the hyphen altogether would be preferable.

A word about the practical utility of the two books will not be out of place. Neither is too bulky (Blochmann has 148 pages of text, Wait 179), nor too tedious for a class beginning scien-

tific German. Wait's *Reader* has the advantage of being printed in Roman type. Both books have given satisfaction in the class-room. Wait is a little too difficult as an introductory text; it should be preceded by a simpler book like Blochmann. If both are carefully translated, the student will have a good basis for independent reading in scientific German.

FREDERICK W. C. LIEDER.

Harvard University.

Studies in Victor Hugo's Dramatic Characters, by JAMES D. BRUNER, Ph. D., Professor of the Romance Languages in the University of North Carolina. With an Introduction by RICHARD GREEN MOULTON, Ph. D., Head of the Department of General Literature in the University of Chicago. Ginn and Company, 1908. Pages xx + 171.

There are some of us who, without being compelled by our tasks to do so, enjoy going back every few years to the drama of Hugo. Excepting *Cromwell*, the root of it, and *The Burgraves*, the seed of it, the whole plant is good eating, and renews itself perennially. The situations never fail to thrill, the bursts of lyricism are as poignant as ever, and the absurdities are, in the technical language of college girls, "simply lovely." The critical soul is beyond hope when it can no longer be stirred by melodramas which were able to set all Paris by the ears, and bring their author into court.

And now comes Professor Bruner, with four solid, honest, "inductive" studies to persuade us that the main characters in *Hernani*, *Ruy Blas*, and *Lucrezia* can each be harmonized into a unity of design. To do him justice, he sticks at *Lucrezia*, and in spite of the pathetic appeal of her maternity, declares her an impossibility. But in the case of *Ruy Blas*, it is remarkable with what thorough-going pains he collects his data, with what impetus he moves forward, and how far he actually carries us with him. He overlooks nothing. He piles up the facts, and will possibly convince even M. Doumic that *Ruy Blas*

is not utterly ridiculous. Perhaps Ruy Blas is no more of a Jekyll-Hyde than Victor Hugo was. At all events, the analysis is conducted with exactness and sympathy, and constitutes a warning against hasty impressionism.

By the very terms of his preface, we must not look to Professor Bruner for much psychological or historical criticism. But his work will steady and assist any student who takes his ideas chiefly, say, from Brunetière. Indirectly it throws considerable light upon Hugo and France. When half a nation is melodramatic, a great melodramatist finds a sympathetic audience, and can rouse them with pictures of other times for which it has deep and unsuspected affinities. Incongruous as are the characteristics of Hernani, the situations are not more stagey than the facts of Spanish chivalry. And it is pleasant to see Professor Moulton bringing this out in his admirably written introduction. After tracing the main course of Greek Drama through mediævalism to its divergence in France and England, and showing Hugo's own division of instinct between situation and character, he says: "It seems to me a somewhat perverse criticism that turns from dramatic development like this to inquire curiously into the exact degree of probability in the combination of elements imagined as basis of character." Professor Moulton has sometimes been suspected of despising historical criticism. In his well-known instance on knowing "all the details of the play," he has sometimes been accused of thinking those details as interesting to one generation as to another. It is quite clear that he does not, in any such absurd sense, regard every masterpiece *sub specie aternitatis*. Science works with the category of time, and all that Professor Moulton insists on is knowing the facts before constructing a theory.

Professor Bruner makes free use of Shakespeare for illustrative purposes. His use of Hamlet, indeed, is perhaps too free, since he seems to accept merely the conventional interpretation of the prince. This interpretation, however, would appear to be permanently qualified by such studies as that of Professor Charlton Lewis.

It may be in place to suggest that Professor Bruner should translate the nine plays, and that some publisher should bring them out in a cheap uniform series. The appeal of such studies would

be greatly widened if this important section of French literature were easily available in translation.

E. H. LEWIS.

Lewis Institute, Chicago.

ARNOLD's *Fritz auf Ferien*, edited with introduction, vocabulary and notes by A. W. SPANHOOFD, Director of German in the High Schools of Washington, D. C. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1906.

The presentation of every story of this character is to be welcomed by the teacher of German. The genuinely German sentiment, the delicate humor, the steady progress of the story to a natural and charming conclusion, are all points which make for interest on the part of the student and to a certain extent, help the text to read itself. From a pedagogical point of view, the story is valuable for the great amount of every-day German it contains. Indeed, there are so many idiomatic expressions in it that they can hardly all be mastered by an elementary class.

It is to be regretted that the present edition has been done so carelessly that the teacher has continually to check up the notes and the pupils complain constantly of omitted words in the vocabulary. The name of Dr. Spanhoofd upon a title-page should be a guarantee against slipshod work of this kind. The following have been noted. 1) Omissions in vocabulary: *demgemäss*, *Geschehene*, *dick*, *Haken*, *unbesorgt*, *aufsetzen*, *Stock*, *plötzlich*, *ergeben*, *Meerschwein* in the sense of 'porpoise,' to explain the joke on pages 32 and 33; 2) careless errors: the word *verwunden* is referred back to *überwinden*, which is not given at all. The only hint as to the meaning of *Herumstreifen* is to be found under *umherstreifen*. *Reihe* is given as meaning 'turn,' when the meaning (p. 26) is 'series.' Several times the spelling in the vocabulary differs from that of the text; e. g., *Spezies* and *Species*, *tödtlich*, *töttlich*. Misprints are few. There is a dropt *e* in the word *Wagentür* in the vocabulary and in one or two places the plates have become worn. The spelling does not conform to the latest orthography.

Some of the notes need revision. Page 2, note 1: *mauskahl geschoren*. "Reference is made to a mouse as having very short hair; thus, *mauskahl*, as bald as a mouse." This is obviously wrong. The reference is to the hairless tail of the mouse, which like all rodents, has a bald tail. It might also refer to the condition of the young mice at time of birth. There is no note on the difficult passage on page 26 beginning, "Eine ganze Reihe von Aufmerksamkeiten schlangen sich" Here it should be shown that the *Reihe* is singular, the verb is plural, due to the influence of the plural *Aufmerksamkeiten*. This same error of attraction often occurs in colloquial English. The passage as it stands without a note causes needless difficulty even to a good student.

It is axiomatic that a text for elementary pupils should be as free from error as human ingenuity can make it. At the beginning of the pupil's study of a language each unnecessary stumbling-block does incalculable harm, and so a text as carelessly edited as the present is unsafe to put in the hands of beginners. It is too bad that in this second imprint of the text these errors have not been eliminated, and it is only to be hoped that a speedy revision will obviate the mistakes which are now found.

G. H. DANTON.

Stanford University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

A NOTE ON SPENSER'S ARCHAISM AND CICERO.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—In his letter to "the most excellent and learned both orator and poete, Mayster Gabriell Harvey", that busy-body friend of Spenser, whose desire to follow the example of his "Author" and remain "Immertô" has provided a wide field of conjecture in later times as to his identity, besides promising to furnish a "glosse" for the words in the poems to follow, which are "so auncient," "something hard, and of most men unused," desires to justify and warrant Spenser's

stylistic trick of archaizing. He declares as his own belief that "those auncient solemn wordes are a great ornament." Casting about for classical authority for the poet's practice, he lights upon Cicero. To quote the "glosser":

"For, if my memory faile not, Tullie, in that booke wherein he endevoureth to set forth the paterne of a perfect Oratour, sayth that oftentimes an auncient worde maketh the style seeme grave, and as it were reverend. . . . Yet nether every where must old words be stuffed in. . . ."

With this "E. K." seeks to leave the impression that Spenser's "immoderate and constant archaism" carried the authority of Cicero's approval. So far as a single passage in the *De Oratore*, to which he undoubtedly refers, is concerned, "E. K." has quoted Cicero correctly. In Book III, cap. 38, Crassus says:

"There are three qualities . . . in a simple word which the orator may employ to illustrate and adorn his language; he may choose either an unusual word (*inusitatum*), or one that is new or metaphorical. Unusual words are generally of ancient (*vetusta*) date or fashion, and such as have been out of use in daily conversation; these are allowed more freely to poetical licence than to ours [oratorical], . . . which if properly introduced, a speech assumes an air of greater grandeur (*grandior*)."¹

"E. K." has, however, told only half the truth in regard to Cicero's attitude towards the use of archaic words. With a single reference, taken out of its context, he makes Cicero an advocate of archaizing. Cicero's interest in questions of usage, as is generally known, was slight.² In the *De Oratore* there is no detailed treatment of diction as a quality of style. Cicero dismisses this subject as one of easy attainment. Yet where

¹ Translated by J. S. Watson, London, 1855, p. 375.

² Professor G. L. Hendrickson, "*De Analogia* of Julius Cæsar," *Classical Philology*, I, 2, recounts most clearly the trend of Cicero's stylistic studies. He says: "Cicero speaks almost contemptuously, certainly slightly, of that goal of effort, to the attainment of which the contemporary purists were bending all the efforts of their elaborate grammatical and literary studies. Against their grammar, with its worship of correctness and purity, he arrays the ancient mistress of emotional speech, rhetoric."

he has casually, here and there, touched upon the question of the use of obsolete words he has expressed an opinion contrary to that which "E. K." seems to desire to fasten upon him. The following quotations from the third Book of the *De Oratore* will show Cicero's attitude towards Spenser's mannerism:

"There is also a *fault* which some industriously strive to attain; a rustic and rough pronunciation is agreeable to some, that their language, if it has that tone, may seem to partake more of antiquity (*antiquitatem*)."¹ Cap. XI.

"... an object [purity in the Latin tongue] which we shall doubtless effect, ... adopting words in common use (*verbis usitatis*)."² Cap. XIII.

"There is such a jumble of strange words, that language which ought to throw light upon things, involves them in obscurity and darkness."³ Cap. XIII.

"For I do not imagine it to be expected of me that I should admonish you to beware that your language be not poor, or rude, or vulgar, or obsolete (*obsoleta*)."⁴ Cap. XXV.

"In regard then to words taken in their own proper sense, it is a merit in the orator to avoid mean and obsolete (*obsoleta*) ones."⁵ Cap. XXXVII.

"If a word be antique (*vetustum*), but such, however, as usage (*consuetudo*) will tolerate, ..."⁶ Cap. XLIII.

Among classical writers on style "E. K." might easily have found authority with which to bolster up his defence. Cicero, however, would never have given his approval to the archaic twist of Spenser's style.

JAMES FINCH ROYSTER.

University of North Carolina.

THE SECOND EDITION OF DRYDEN'S *Virgil*.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—In *Modern Language Notes* for May, 1904 (vol. XIX, p. 125), I stated, on the basis of a volume owned by the Yale University Library, that the second edition of Dryden's *Virgil* was printed in 1697, with the same title-page as the first edition of the same year. This account I have later found to be mistaken. The Harvard College Library now possesses a copy of the real second edition, which, as Malone states, was published in 1698. The book on which I based my earlier article proves to be a made-up volume; it is a copy of the second edition (1698),

but the title-page has been removed, and replaced by one from a copy of the first edition (1697). In the Cambridge edition of Dryden's *Poetical Works*, now in press, I have attempted a collation of all significant variations between the first and second editions of his *Virgil*.

GEORGE R. NOYES.

University of California.

KING JAMES' CLAIM TO RHYME ROYAL.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—Some years ago, in discussing the word *ballade*, the editors of the *New English Dictionary* perpetuated an error which seems to have gone uncorrected in print;¹ since it not only remains uncorrected but is practically reaffirmed by them in a recent issue of the dictionary, under the word *rhyme*.² This is the statement, apparently a mere guess of some scholar of the nineteenth century, that *rhyme royal*, or *ballade royal*, owes its name to the fact that King James I of Scotland, a "royal" poet, wrote *The Kingis Quair* in that metre. May I present some evidence tending to set this matter right, and ask your readers for further information in regard to the origin of the terms?

A famous form of Old French verse was the *Chant Royal*, a poetic structure of stanzas of eleven lines each, with a common refrain, concluded by an envoy of five or six lines. In the fourteenth century the Provençal *ballade* became a ruling form in Northern France, and was speedily conventionalized. It borrowed from the elder form its structure of stanzas with a common refrain, concluded by a short envoy. The stanzas were limited to three. At first but two rhymes were allowed; afterwards it was merely the rule that each stanza should have the same rhymes as the others. These were frequently arranged as ababbce, or ababbce.³

¹ Volume I, p. 639c.

² Volume VIII, p. 634c. Here the editors do not themselves repeat the statement, but after citing Latham, 1841, *Eng. Lang.*, by name only, they quote from "1873, H. Morley, *Eng. Lit.* v, Chaucer's own seven-lined stanza, which ... has been called rhyme royall, because this particular disciple [*sc.* James I of Scotland] used it." This is the only statement as to origin that is made or cited, and it must be concluded that the editors are still of their old opinion, and desire to be held responsible for this restatement.

³ Cf. H. Chatelain, *Recherches sur le Vers français au x^{ve} Siècle*, Paris, 1908, chaps. x-xi, for further description of these forms.

When Chaucer used the word *ballade* he undoubtedly meant the first of these, for he calls one of his poems so written "made in *ballade*" (*Legend*, 539).

Gower used the same term when he wrote his *French Ballades*. Some of these are, however, of seven lines, some of eight.

Probably about 1402 (see *The Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, for March, 1908), Quixley translated Gower's *Traitié*, and says of it

"Gower it made in frensh with gret studie
In *ballades ryal*."

If the date be correct, this is probably the earliest extant use of the term in English. Quixley intended it to represent the structure of three stanzas of sevens, ababbce, having the same rhymes, and with a common refrain.

John Lydgate does not use the term *royal*, and he extends the word *ballade* to mean stanzas of sevens, with or without the same rhymes as others. When he said

"I took a penne and wroot in my maneer
The said *balladys* as they stondyn heere,"⁴

he proceeded in what we now call *rhyme royal*.

Not long after 1430, John Shirley wrote the famous ms. Trinity College Cambridge R. 3. 20. Three items in it have these titles:

Balade Ryal de saine counsulle.
Balade moult Bon et Ryal.
Balade Ryal made by oure laureat poete of
Albyon (Chaucer).

These poems, two of them French and one English, show the Chaucerian use of the term *ballade*. But the same scribe uses the term *balade ryal* of poems transcribed twenty years later, in ms. Bodley Ashmole 59, where the stanzas do not have the same rhymes, but merely a common refrain.

When John Hardyng wrote his *Chronicle* (c. 1440), he says after censuring the use by earlier chroniclers of the short couplet,

"Into *balade* I wyll it now translate,"

and proceeds in the *Troilus* stanza. So Barclay in his *Ship of Fools*, 1509, speaks of "My *balade* bare of frute and eloquence."

The author of the *Summum Sapientie* (c. 1450) calls the same metre *staves seven*.

In his preface to his print of Burgh's *Cato*, 1483, Caxton calls the same metre *balades ryal*, and Fabyan, 1494, in his *Chronicle* also speaks

⁴Ms. Harley 2255, f. 88b, *The Fifteen Joys of Our Lady*.

of "baladde ryall." Similarly Stephen Hawes, (c. 1510) calls Lydgate "the most dulcet spring of famous rhetoric, with *ballade royal*."

The term *rhyme royal* appears first in George Gascoigne's *Instructions for Verse*, 1575, as *rhythm royal*.⁵ Gascoigne reserved the term *ballade* for the newer six-line stanza ababce.⁶ But King James VI of Scotland, in his remarks on verse, 1584, calls the eight-line stanza ababbce, *Ballat Royal*, and the seven-line stanza ababbce *Troilus stanza*.

It has remained for modern critics to fasten the term *rhyme royal* definitely upon the seven-line stanza, and then to justify it by a plausible legend of its kingly origin.

To sum up: it is probable that the term *royal* was attached in France to the *ballade* (though I can only judge by Shirley's French, and would ask for further light) by analogy with the earlier *Chant Royal*.⁷ With this it came to England, and the term *ballade* first, and afterwards *ballade royal*, were extended to signify the *ballade*'s stanzaic structure regardless of refrain or community of rhyme. Gascoigne gives us the word *rhythm* in place of *ballade*, and assigns *ballade* to another form of verse, in which meaning it has not been kept. Not a hint of King James I as using this metre, or giving it its name, is made by any of the writers I have cited. His poem was certainly unknown to those who wrote before his day (1424), and probably to those who wrote after, preserved as it was in a single ms. It is time our lexicographers abandoned this nineteenth-century fiction.

HENRY NOBLE MACCRACKEN.

New Haven, Conn.

⁵See the *New Oxford Dictionary* under *Rhythm*, sb. 1b. It should be noted that Gascoigne, while ignorant of King James' claim to the phrase, himself gives a wrong account of the term. *Cert. Notes, Instr. Eng. Verse* (Arb., 38): "Rythme royall is a verse of tenne sillables, and seuen such verses make a staffe [etc.]. This hath bene called Rithme royall, and surely it is a royall kinde of verse, serving best for grand discourses." This use of the stanza, as in *The Mirror for Magistrates*, is a far cry from the *Ballade royal* of the French school of courtly love-poetry.

⁶It is not in common use much before *Gorboduc* (c. 1561), though Lydgate used it at least once, in the envoy to *A Prayer to St. Katherine, St. Margaret, and St. Mawdeleyne* (c. 1430).

⁷But cf. the term *arbaletrière royal*, Chatelain, *l. c.*, pp. 185, 190.